Financial Report

Year Ended June 30, 2011

Under provisions of state law, this report is a public document. Acopy of the report has been submitted to the entity and other appropriate public officials. The report is available for public inspection at the Baton Rouge office of the Legislative Auditor and, where appropriate, at the office of the parish clerk of court.

Release Date JAN 2 5 2012

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Independent Auditors' Report	1-2
BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	
GOVERNMENT-WIDE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (GWFS)	
Statement of net assets	5
Statement of activities	6
FUND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (FFS)	
Major fund descriptions	8
Balance sheet - governmental funds	9
Reconciliation of the governmental funds balance sheet	
to the statement of net assets	10
Statement of revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balances-	
governmental funds	11
Reconciliation of the statement of revenues, expenditures, and	
changes in fund balances of governmental funds to the statement of activities	12
Statement of net assets - proprietary funds	13
Statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in fund net	
assets - proprietary funds	14.
Statement of cash flows - proprietary funds	15-16
Notes to basic financial statements	17-49
REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION	
Budgetary comparison schedules:	
General Fund	51
Sales Tax Special Revenue Fund	52
Public Safety Special Revenue Fund	53
Schedule of funding progress	54
OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION	
Statement of net assets - compared to prior year totals	56
Major Governmental Funds -	
General Fund - budgetary comparison schedule - revenues	57
General Fund - budgetary comparison schedule- expenditures	58-60
Sales Tax Special Revenue Fund - budgetary comparison schedule	61
Public Safety Special Revenue Fund - budgetary comparison schedule	62-63
	(continued)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
Nonmajor Governmental Funds -	
Nonmajor fund descriptions	65-66
Combining balance sheet	67
Combining statement of revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balances	68
Nonmajor special revenue funds -	
Combining balance sheet	70
Combining statement of revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balances	<b>7</b> 1
Nonmajor debt service funds -	
Combining balance sheet	73
Combining statement of revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balances	74
Nonmajor capital projects funds -	
Combining balance sheet	76
Combining statement of revenues, expenditures, and changes in fund balances	77
COMPLIANCE, INTERNAL CONTROL AND OTHER GRANT INFORMATION	
Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance	
and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed	
in Accordance with Government Auditing Standards	79-80
Independent Auditor's Report on Compliance with Requirements That Could Have	
a Direct and Material Effect on Each Major Program and on Internal Control	
over Compliance in Accordance with OMB Circular A-133	81-82
Schedule of expenditures of federal awards	83
Notes to schedule of expenditures of federal awards	84
Schedule of findings and questioned costs	85-87
Summary schedule of current and prior year audit findings	
and corrective action plan	88-103

#### KOLDER, CHAMPAGNE, SLAVEN & COMPANY, LLC

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

C Burton Kolder, CPA\* Russell F, Champagne, CPA\* Victor R, Slaven, CPA\* P, Troy Coundib, CPA\* Gerald A, Thibodeaux, Jr., CPA\* Robert S, Carter, CPA\* Athur R, Mixon, CPA\*

Tyries E. Mixon, Jr., CPA
Allien J, LaBry, CPA
Allien J, LaBry, CPA
Allien R. Logor, CPA, PFS, CSA\*
Penny Angleie Scruggns, CPA
Christine L. Cousin, CPA
Mary T. Thibodeaux, CPA
Marshall W. Guldry, CPA
Alan M. Taylor, CPA
Alan M. Taylor, CPA
Alanes R. Roy, CPA
Robert J, Metz, CPA
Robert J, Metz, CPA
Kelly M. Doucet, CPA
Cheryl L. Bartisty, CPA
Mandy B, Seit, CPA
Paul L. Delcambre, Jr. CPA
Wanda F, Arcement, CPA, CVA
Kristin B, Dauzal, CPA
Clandyn C, Anderson Sr., CPA
Cardyn C, Anderson, CPA
Matthew E, Margaglio, CPA
Jane R, Hebert, CPA

Retired. Conrad O. Chepman, CPA\* 2006 Harry J. Clostic, CPA 2007

#### OFFICES

450 East Main Street New Iberia, LA 70560 Phone (337) 357-9204 Fax (337) 367-9208

113 East Bridge St. Breaux Bridge, LA 70517 Phone (337) 332-4020 Fax (337) 332-2867 200 South Main Street Abbeville, LA 70510 Phone (337) 893-7944 Fex (337) 893-7946

1234 David Dr. Ste 203 Morgan City, LA 70380 Phone (985) 384-2020 Fax (985) 384-3020

1013 Mein Street Franklin, LA 70538 Phone (337) 828-0272 Fax (337) 828-0290

408 West Cotton Street Ville Platte, LA 70586 Phone (337) 363-2792 Fax (337) 363-3049 133 East Weddi St Marksville LA 71351 Phone (319) 253-9252 Fax (318) 253-8681

332 West Sidth Avenue Oberlin, LA 70855 Phone (337) 639-4737 Fax (337) 639-4568 621 Main Street Pineville, LA 71360 Phone (318) 442-4421 Fax (318) 442-9633

WEB SITE WWW.KCSRCPAS.COM

The Honorable C. Robert Rose, Mayor and Members of the City Council City of Leesville, Louisiana

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the governmental activities, the businesstype activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of the City of Leesville, Louisiana, as of and for the year ended June 30, 2011, which collectively comprise the basic financial statements of the City's primary government as listed in the table of contents. These financial statements are the responsibility of the City's management. Our responsibility is to express opinions on these financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinions.

The financial statements referred to above include only the primary government of the City of Leesville, Louisiana, which consists of all funds, organizations, institutions, agencies, departments, and offices that comprise the City's legal entity. The financial statements do not include financial data for the City's legally separate component units, which accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America require to be reported with the financial data of the City's primary government. As a result, the primary government financial statements do not purport to, and do not, present fairly the financial position of the reporting entity of the City of Leesville, Louisiana as of June 30, 2011, and the changes in its financial position and its cash flows, where applicable, for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information for the primary government of the City of Leesville, Louisiana, as of June 30, 2011, and the respective changes in financial position and cash flows, where applicable, for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

<sup>\*</sup> A Professional Accounting Corporation

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we have also issued our report dated December 16, 2011 on our consideration of the City of Leesville's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards and should be considered in assessing the results of our audit.

Accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America require that the supplementary information on pages 51 through 54 be presented to supplement the basic financial statements. Such information, although not a part of the basic financial statements, is required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, who considers it to be an essential part of financial reporting for placing the basic financial statements in an appropriate operational, economic, or historical context. We have applied certain limited procedures to the required supplementary information in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, which consisted of inquiries of management about the methods of preparing the information and comparing the information for consistency with management and the methods of preparing the information and comparing the information for consistency with management's responses to our inquiries, the basic financial statements, and other knowledge we obtained during our audit of the basic financial statements. We do not express an opinion or provide any assurance on the information because the limited procedures do not provide us with sufficient evidence to express an opinion or provide any assurance.

The City of Leesville has not presented management's discussion and analysis that the Governmental Accounting Standards Board has determined is necessary to supplement, although not required to be part of, the basic financial statements.

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the City of Leesville, Louisiana's financial statements as a whole. The other supplementary information on pages 56 through 104 is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the financial statements. The accompanying schedule of expenditures of federal awards is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required by U.S. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations, and is also not a required part of the financial statements. The combining and individual nonmajor fund financial statements and the schedule of expenditures of federal awards are the responsibility of management and were derived from and relate directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the financial statements. The information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the financial statements or to the financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the information is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the financial statements as a whole.

Kolder, Champagne, Slaven & Company, LLC Certified Public Accountants

Lafayette, Louisiana December 16, 2011

BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

GOVERNMENT-WIDE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (GWFS)

# Statement of Net Assets June 30, 2011

ASSETS	Governmental Activities	Business-Type Activities	Total
Cash and interest-bearing deposits	\$ 926,291	\$ 240,255	\$ 1,166,546
Receivables	547,095	378,971	926,066
Due from other governmental agencies	30,617	227,074	257,691
Inventories	132,696	-	132,696
Other assets	37,136	11,134	48,270
Restricted assets:			
Cash and interest-bearing deposits	-	321,555	321,555
Capital assets:			•
Land and construction in progress	351,186	502,027	853,213
Capital assets, net	15,333,028	10,936,383	26,269,411
Total assets	17,358,049	12,617,399	29,975,448
LIABILITIES			
Accounts and other payables	428,233	165,621	593,854
Claims payable	160,687	-	160,687
Interest payable	58,519	36,074	94,593
Long-term liabilities:			
Customer deposits payable	-	242,357	242,357
Compensated absences payable	253,951	35,585	289,536
OPEB obligation payable	1,843,991	550,802	2,394,793
Bonds, notes, and leases due within one year	493,742	484,115	977,857
Bonds, notes, and leases due after one year, net	3,598,447	2,66 <u>3,</u> 976	6,262,423
Total liabilities	6,837,570	4,178,530	11,016,100
NET ASSETS			
Invested in capital assets, net of related dobt	11,592,025	8,493,653	20,085,678
Restricted for debt service	383,346	•	383,346
Unrestricted (deficit)	(1,454,892)	(54,784)	(1,509,676)
Total net assets	\$10,520,479	\$ 8,438,869	\$18,959,348

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the basic financial statements.

Statement of Activities For the Year Ended June 30, 2011

		Pro	Program Revenues	Camital	Net	Net (Expense) Revenues and Changes in Net Assets	and "
		Fees, Fines, and	Grants and	Grants and	Governmental	Business-Type	2
Activities	Expenses	Charges for Services	Contributions	Contributions	Activities	Activities	Total
Governmental activities:							
General government	\$ 674,438	\$ 472,869	\$ 32,031	· •	\$ (169,538)	, <b>∽</b>	\$ (169,538)
Public safety	4,816,006	647,486	474,351		(3,694,169)	•	(3,694,169)
Public works	1,171,974	•	•		(1,171,974)		(1,171,974)
Economic development	681,347	268,025	•	,	(413,322)		(413,322)
Culture and recreation	603,439	78,865	27,715	•	(496,859)		(496,859)
Interest on long-term debt	178,673		•		(178,673)	•	(178,673)
Total governmental activities	8,125,878	1,467,245	534,097		(6,124,536)	-	(6,124,536)
Business-type activities:							
Sewer	928,801	598,383		1,082,779	•	752,361	752,361
Water	1,982,148	1,682,038	•			(300,110)	(300,110)
Total business-type activities	2,910,949	2,280,421	,	1,082,779		452,251	452,251
Total	\$11,036,827	\$3,747,666	\$ 534,097	\$ 1,082,779	(6,124,536)	452,251	(5,672,285)
	General revenues:						
	Laxes -	INGS - A disease serves leaded for managed anniquences	,		217 622		117 623
	Ad valorem	Ad universitated for citant interments			160,513		566,112
	TOTOTRA DA	laxes, levica for succe impro	Overneurs		100,001		C10'001
	Ad valorem	Ad valorem taxes, levied for sewer system			•	333,931	333,931
	Sales and us	Sales and use taxes, levied for public works and recreation	orks and recreation		2,809,232	•	2,809,232
	Sales and us	Sales and use taxes, levied for public safety	fety		1,206,729	ı	1,206,729
	Franchise taxes	Kes			542,640	h	542,640
	Grants and con	Grants and contributions not restricted to specific programs	specific programs -				
	State sources				22,193	•	22,193
	Interest and inv	Interest and investment earnings			2,600	1,097	8,697
	Miscellaneous				128,061	11,730	139,791
	Transfers				539,318	(\$19,318)	
	Total go	Total general revenues and transfers	P2		5,633,919	(192,560)	5,441,359
	Change	Change in net assets			(490,617)	259,691	(230,926)
	Net assets - July 1	Net assets - July 1, 2010, as restated			11,011,096	8,179,178	19,190,274
	Net assets - June 30, 2011	30, 2011			\$10,520,479	\$ 8,438,869	\$18,959,348

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the basic financial statements.

FUND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (FFS)

#### MAJOR FUND DESCRIPTIONS

#### **General Fund**

The General Fund is used to account for resources traditionally associated with governments which are not required to be accounted for in another fund.

#### Special Revenue Funds

Special revenue funds are used to account for specific revenues that are legally restricted to expenditures for particular purposes.

#### Sales Tax Fund

To account for the receipt and use of proceeds of the City's 1% sales and use tax. These taxes are dedicated and used for the purpose of constructing, improving, extending, and maintaining streets, sidewalks, bridges, drains, subsurface drainage, sewers and sewerage disposal works; fire department stations and facilities; and public parks and recreational facilities, and purchased and acquiring the necessary land, equipment and furnishings for any of the aforesaid public works, improvements and facilities.

#### Public Safety Fund

To account for the receipt and use of proceeds of the City's 1/2% sales and use tax. These taxes are dedicated and used for the purpose of improving, operating, and maintaining the public safety services within the City of Leesville, specifically, to provide funds to acquire necessary police and fire protection equipment and other facilities so as to increase the level of services and protection in the City.

#### **Enterprise Funds**

#### Sewer Fund

To account for the provision of sewerage services to residents of the City. All activities necessary to provide such services are accounted for in this fund, including, but not limited to, administration, operations, maintenance, financing and related debt service, and billing and collection.

#### Water Fund

To account for the provision of water services to residents of the City. All activities necessary to provide such services are accounted for in this fund, including, but not limited to, administration, operations, maintenance, financing and related debt service, and billing and collection.

#### Balance Sheet - Governmental Funds June 30, 2011

	General	Sales Tax	Public Safety	Other Governmental	Total
ASSETS					
Cash and interest-bearing deposits	\$ -	\$ 632,503	\$ -	\$293,788	\$ 926,291
Receivables -					
Due from other funds	207,724	-	63,075	160,613	431,412
Due from other governmental agencies	3,816	-	13,301	13,500	30,617
Other	154,401	257,981	134,713	_	547,095
Inventories	132,696				132,696
Total assets	\$498,637	\$ 890,484	\$211,089	\$467,901	\$2,068,111
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES					
Liabilities:					
Accounts payable	\$180,008	\$ 13,379	\$173,110	\$ -	\$ 366,497
Accrued liabilities	15,952	7,805	37,979	-	61,736
Due to other funds	141,990	270,799	-	18,623	431,412
Claims liability	160,687			<u> </u>	160,687
Total liabilities	498,637	291,983	211,089	18,623	1,020,332
Fund balances -					
Restricted for debt service	-	-	•	441,865	441,865
Assigned		598,501		7,413	605,914
Total fund balances		598,501		449,278	1,047,779
Total liabilities and fund balances	<u>\$498,637</u>	\$ 890,484	\$211,089	\$467,901	\$2,068,111

#### Reconciliation of the Governmental Funds Balance Sheet to the Statement of Net Assets June 30, 2011

Total fund balances for governmental funds at June 30, 2011		\$ 1,047,779
Total net assets reported for governmental activities in the statement of net assets is different because:		
Capital assets used in governmental activities are not financial resources		
and, therefore, are not reported in the funds. Those assets consist of:		
Land	\$ 303,856	
Construction in progress	47,330	
Buildings and improvements, net of \$4,093,328 accumulated depreciation	7,006,024	
Infrastructure, net of \$15,140,131 accumulated depreciation	6,906,124	
Equipment and vehicles, net of \$4,451,998 of accumulated depreciation	1,420,880	15,684,214
Prepaid expenses at June 30, 2011		37,136
Long-term liabilities at June 30, 2011:		
Compensated absences	(253,951)	
OPEB obligation	(1,843,991)	
Bonds payable	(3,165,000)	
Capital leases	(927,189)	
Accrued interest payable	(58,519)	_(6,248,650)
Total net assets of governmental activities at June 30, 2011		\$10,520,479

# Governmental Funds Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances For the Year Ended June 30, 2011

	General	Sales Tax	Public Safety	Other Governmental	Total
Revenues:	General	Sales Tax	Salcty	Governmental	1 Otal
Taxes -					
Ad valorem	\$ 217,533	<b>\$</b> -	\$ -	\$ 160,613	\$ 378,146
Sales	-	2,809,232	1,206,729	-	4,015,961
Franchise	542,640	-,,	•	_	542,640
Licenses and permits	472,869	-	_	-	472,869
Intergovernmental	26,982	-	474,351	54,957	556,290
Fines and forfeits	-	-	156,383	-	156,383
Charges for services	268,025	78,865	35,079	456,024	837,993
Miscellaneous	107,110	11,627	13,521	3,403	135,661
Total revenues	1,635,159	2,899,724	1,886,063	674,997	7,095,943
Expenditures:					
Current:					
General government	543,043	70,013	-	42,301	655,357
Public safety	-	-	3,424,540	535,073	3,959,613
Public works	897,362	-	-	35,435	932,797
Economic development	229,161	-	-	33	229,194
Culture and recreation	-	456,725	-	-	456,725
Debt service	21,116	-	188,278	460,829	670,223
Capital outlay	49,174	1,528	90,010		140,712
Total expenditures	1,739,856	528,266	3,702,828	<u>1,</u> 073,671	7,044,621
Excess (deficiency) of revenues					
over expenditures	(104,697)	2,371,458	(1,816,765)	(398,674)	51,322
Other financing sources (uses):					
Transfers in	947,725	-	2,545,178	53,531	3,546,434
Transfers out	<u>(748,457</u> )	(2,226,453)		(32,206)	(3,007,116)
Total other financing sources (uses)	199,268	(2,226,453)	2,545,178	21,325	539,318
Net changes in fund balances	94,571	145,005	728,413	(377,349)	590,640
Fund balances (deficit), beginning, as restated	(94,571)	453,496	(728,413)	826,627	457,139
Fund balances, ending	<u>s - </u>	\$ 598,501	<u> </u>	\$ 449,278	\$ 1,047,779

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the basic financial statements.

# Reconciliation of the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balances of Governmental Funds to the Statement of Activities For the Year Ended June 30, 2011

Total net changes in fund balances at June 30, 2011 per		
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances		\$ 590,640
The change in net assets reported for governmental activities in the		
statement of activities is different because:		
Governmental funds report capital outlays as expenditures. However,		
in the statement of activities, the cost of those assets is allocated over		
their estimated useful lives and reported as depreciation expense.		
Capital outlay which is considered expenditures on the Statement		
of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances	\$ 139,184	
Depreciation expense for the year ended June 30, 2011	(998,771)	(859,587)
Principal retirement considered as an expenditure on Statement of		
Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance		483,734
Difference between interest on long-term debt on modified accrual basis		
versus interest on long-term debt on the accrual basis		7,816
Excess of compensated absences used over compensated absences earned		186,895
Net OPEB obligation at June 30, 2011 not requiring the use of current		
economic resources and, therefore, not recorded as a fund expenditure		(900,115)
Total changes in net assets at June 30, 2011 per Statement of Activities		\$ (490,617)

#### Statement of Assets - Proprietary Funds June 30, 2011

•	Business -Typ	e Activities - E	nterprise Funds
	Sewer	Water	Total
ASSETS	<del></del>		
Current assets:			
Cash and interest-bearing deposits	\$ 214,343	\$ 25,912	\$ 240,255
Receivables:			
Accounts, net	241,547	137,424	3 <b>78,</b> 971
Due from other governmental agencies	35,714	191,360	227,074
Prepaid items	2,926	2,925	5,851
Total current assets	494,530	357,621	<u>852,151</u>
Noncurrent assets:			
Restricted assets -			
Cash and interest-bearing deposits	35,092	286,463	321,555
Deferred bond issuance costs	5,283	-	5 <b>,28</b> 3
Land and construction in progress	137,036	364,991	502,027
Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation	7,248,880	<u>3,687,503</u>	10,936,383
Total noncurrent assets	7,426,291	4,338,957	11,765,248
Total assets	7,920,821	4,696,578	12,617,399
LIABILITIES			
Current liabilities:			
Accounts and other payables	67,186	98,435	165,621
General obligation bonds	325,000	-	325,000
Revenue bonds	35,714	85,000	120,714
Notes payable	-	38,401	38,401
Accrued interest payable	13,804	22,270	36,074
Total current liabilities	441,704	244,106	685,810
Noncurrent liabilities:			
Customer deposits payable	-	242,357	242,357
Compensated absences payable	28,130	7,455	35,585
OPEB obligation payable	61,200	489,602	550,802
General obligation bonds	930,000	1,235,000	2,165,000
Revenue bonds payable	40,000	-	40,000
Notes payable		458,976	<u>45<b>8,976</b></u>
Total noncurrent liabilities	1,059,330	2,433,390	<u>3,492,720</u>
Total liabilities	1,501,034	2,677,496	4,178,530
NET ASSETS			
Invested in capital assets, net of related debt	6,076,490	2,417,163	8,493,653
Unrestricted (deficit)	343,297	(398,081)	(54,784)
Total net assets	\$ 6,419,787	\$ 2,019,082	\$ 8,438,869

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the basic financial statements.

# Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Fund Net Assets - Proprietary Funds For the Year Ended June 30, 2011

	Business -Type	Activities - En	terprise Funds
	Sewer	Water	Total
Operating revenues:			
Charges for services	\$ 598,383	\$ 1,682,038	\$ 2,280,421
Miscellaneous		11,730	11,730
Total operating revenues	598,383	1,693,768	2,292,151
Operating expenses:			
Salaries	168,214	482,097	650,311
Employee benefits	27,986	93,226	121,212
OPEB expense	29,874	238,991	268,865
Operating supplies	<b>58,35</b> 1	169,780	228,131
Vehicle expense	12,619	26,976	39,595
Utilities and communications	141,313	222,794	364,107
Insurance	69,668	223,528	293,196
Repairs and maintenance	71,565	72,862	144,427
Bad debt	16,975	18,372	35,347
Miscellaneous	48,090	5,077	53,167
Depreciation and amortization	238,381	374,569	612,950
Total operating expenses	<u>883,036</u>	1,928,272	2,811,308
Operating loss	(284,653)	(234,504)	(519,157)
Nonoperating revenues (expenses):			
Interest income	1,038	59	1,097
Ad valorem taxes	333,931	-	333,931
Interest expense	(45,765)	(53,876)	(99,641)
Total nonoperating revenues (expenses)	289,204	(53,817)	235,387
Income (loss) before			
contributions and transfers	4,551	(288,321)	(283,770)
Contributions	753,120	329,659	1,082,779
Transfers in (out)	40,828	(580,146)	(539,318)
Change in net assets	798,499	(538,808)	259,691
Net assets, beginning	5,621,288	2,557,890	8,179,178
Net assets, ending	\$ 6,419,787	\$ 2,019,082	\$ 8,438,869

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the basic financial statements.

# Statement of Cash Flows Proprietary Funds For the Year Ended June 30, 2011

	Business-Typ	e Activities -En	terprise Funds
	Sewer	Water	Total
Cash flows from operating activities:		<del></del>	
Receipts from customers	\$ 552,516	\$ 1,677,709	\$ 2,230,225
Payments to suppliers	(377,215)	(795,707)	(1,172,922)
Payments to employees	(193,850)	(575,460)	(769,310)
Other receipts		11,730	11,730
Net cash provided (used) by operating activities	(18,549)	318,272	299,723
Cash flows from noncapital financing activities:			
Transfers from other funds	40,828	-	40,828
Transfers to other funds	(42,876)	(580,146)	(623,022)
Net cash used by noncapital financing activities	(2,048)	<u>(580,146)</u>	(582,194)
Cash flows from capital and related financing activities:			
Principal paid on bonds and notes payable	(315,000)	(80,000)	(395,000)
Interest and fiscal charges paid on revenue bonds	(49,338)	(54,208)	(103,546)
Net increase in customer meter deposits	-	4,480	4,480
Proceeds from ad valorem taxes	333,931	-	333,931
Proceeds from grants	753,120	138,299	891,419
Acquisition of property, plant and equipment	(821,899)	(340,742)	(1,162,641)
Net cash used by capital and related			
financing activities	<u>(99,186</u> )	(332,171)	(431,357)
Cash flows from investing activities:			
Interest earned	1,038	59	1,097
Net decrease in cash			
and cash equivalents	(118,745)	(593,986)	(712,731)
Cash and cash equivalents, beginning of period	368,180	906,361	1,274,541
Cash and cash equivalents, end of period	\$ 249,435	\$ 312,375	\$ 561,810
			(continued)

#### Statement of Cash Flows Proprietary Funds (continued) For the Year Ended June 30, 2011

	Business-Typ	e Activities - E	nterprise Funds
	Sewer	Water	Total
Reconciliation of operating loss to net cash			
provided (used) by operating activities:			
Operating loss	\$ (284,653)	\$ (234,504)	\$ (519,157)
Adjustments to reconcile operating loss to net		, , ,	
cash provided (used) by operating activities:			
Depreciation	236,400	374,569	610,969
Amortization	1,981	-	1,981
Changes in current assets and liabilities:			
Increase accounts receivable	(45,867)	(4,329)	(50,196)
Increase (decrease) in accounts payable	42,640	(52,130)	(9,490)
Increase (decrease) in compensated		·	
absences payable	1,076	(4,325)	(3,249)
Increase in OPEB obligation payable	29,874	238,991	268,865
Net cash provided (used) by operating activities	<u>\$ (18,549</u> )	\$ 318,272	\$ 299,723
Reconciliation of cash and cash equivalents per statement			
of cash flows to the balance sheet:			
Cash and cash equivalents, beginning of period -			
Cash and interest-bearing deposits - unrestricted	\$ 213,552	\$ 549,744	\$ 763,296
Cash and interest-bearing deposits - restricted	154,628	356,617	511,245
Total cash and cash equivalents, beginning of period	368,180	906,361	1,274,541
Cash and cash equivalents, end of period -			
Cash and interest-bearing deposits - unrestricted	214,343	25,912	240,255
Cash and interest-bearing deposits - restricted	35,092	286,463	321,555
Total cash and cash equivalents, end of period	249,435	312,375	561,810
Net decrease	<u>\$ (118,745)</u>	<u>\$ (593,986)</u>	<b>\$</b> (712,731)

Noncash investing, capital, and financing activities:

The Sewer Fund recorded an amount receivable from the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality of \$35,714 for bonds issued as of June 30, 2011, for which funds had not yet been received/expended.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the basic financial statements.

#### Notes to Financial Statements

#### (1) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

The accompanying financial statements of the City of Leesville (City) have been prepared in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAP) as applied to governmental units. GAAP includes all relevant Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) pronouncements. In the government-wide financial statements and the fund financial statements for the proprietary funds, Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) pronouncements and Accounting Principles Board (APB) opinions on or before November 30, 1989, have been applied unless those pronouncements conflict with or contradict GASB pronouncements, in which case, GASB prevails. The accounting and reporting framework and the more significant accounting policies are discussed in subsequent subsections of this note.

#### A. Financial Reporting Entity

The City of Leesville was incorporated by proclamation of the Governor on February 15, 1900. The City operates under the council-administrator form of government, governed by the mayor and a seven-member board. The City is located in the parish of Vernon and has a population of approximately 6,000.

As the municipal governing authority, for reporting purposes, the City of Leesville is considered a separate financial reporting entity. The financial reporting entity consists of (a) the primary government (municipality), (b) organizations for which the primary government is financially accountable, (c) other organizations for which the nature and significance of their relationship with the primary government are such that exclusion would cause the reporting entity's financial statements to be misleading or incomplete, and (d) organizations that are closely related to, or financially integrated with the primary government.

Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 14 as amended by Statement No. 39 established criteria for determining which component units should be considered part of the City of Lecsville for financial reporting purposes. The basic criterion for including a potential component unit within the reporting entity is financial accountability. The GASB has set forth criteria to be considered in determining financial accountability. These criteria include:

- 1. Appointing a voting majority of an organization's governing body, and
  - a. The ability of the municipality to impose its will on that organization and/or
  - b. The potential for the organization to provide specific financial benefits to or impose specific financial burdens on the municipality.
- 2. Organizations for which the municipality does not appoint a voting majority but are fiscally dependent on the municipality.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

- 3. Organizations for which the reporting entity's financial statements would be misleading if data of the organization is not included because of the nature or significance of the relationship if all of the following conditions exist:
  - a. The economic resources received or held by the organization are entirely or almost entirely for the direct benefit of the primary government, its component units, or its constituents.
  - b. The primary government (or its component units) is entitled to, or has the ability to otherwise access, a majority of the economic resources received or held by the separate organization.
  - c. The economic resources received or held by an individual organization that the specific primary government (or its component units) is entitled to, or has the ability to otherwise access, are significant to that primary government.
- 4. Organizations that are closely related to, or financially integrated with the primary government.

The following component units are not presented in the accompanying financial statements:

#### City Marshal -

The City Marshal is controlled by the City Marshal, who is an independently elected official. The City Marshal is included as part of the operations of the City Court System. The City Court System is fiscally dependent on the City of Leesville for office space and courtrooms.

#### City Court-

The City Court is controlled by the City Court Judge who is an independently elected official. The City Court is included as part of the operations of the City Court System. The City Court System is fiscally dependent on the City of Lecsville for office space and courtrooms and payment of salaries and other operating expenditures.

Complete financial statements for the component units may be obtained at 101 W. Lee Street, Leesville, LA 71446. These primary government financial statements of the City of Leesville do not include the financial data of the component units described above. This component unit financial data is necessary for reporting in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### B. Basis of Presentation

Government-Wide Financial Statements (GWFS)

The statement of net assets and statement of activities display information about the reporting government as a whole. They include all funds of the reporting entity. The statements distinguish between governmental and business-type activities. Governmental activities generally are financed through taxes, intergovernmental revenues, and other nonexchange revenues. Business-type activities are financed in whole or in part by fees charged to external parties for goods or services.

The statement of activities presents a comparison between direct expenses and program revenues for the business-type activities of the City and for each function of the City's governmental activities. Direct expenses are those that are specifically associated with a program or function and, therefore, are clearly identifiable to a particular function. Program revenues include (a) fees, fines, and charges paid by the recipients of goods or services offered by the programs, and (b) grants and contributions that are restricted to meeting the operational or capital requirements of a particular program. Revenues that are not classified as program revenues, including all taxes, are presented as general revenues.

#### Fund Financial Statements

The accounts of the City are organized and operated on the basis of funds. A fund is an independent fiscal and accounting entity with a separate set of self-balancing accounts. Fund accounting segregates funds according to their intended purpose and is used to aid management in demonstrating compliance with finance-related legal and contractual provisions. The minimum number of funds is maintained consistent with legal and managerial requirements.

The various funds of the City are classified into two categories: governmental and proprietary. The emphasis on fund financial statements is on major governmental and enterprise funds, each displayed in a separate column. A fund is considered major if it is the primary operating fund of the City or meets the following criteria:

- Total assets, liabilities, revenues, or expenditures/expenses of that individual governmental or enterprise fund are at least 10 percent of the corresponding total for all funds of that category or type; and
- b. Total assets, liabilities, revenues, or expenditures/expenses of the individual governmental or enterprise fund are at least 5 percent of the corresponding total for all governmental and enterprise funds combined.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

The major funds of the City are described below:

#### Governmental Funds -

The General Fund is the general operating fund of the City. It is used to account for all financial resources except those required to be accounted for in another fund.

The Sales Tax Special Revenue Fund is used to account for the proceeds of one percent sales and use tax that is legally restricted to expenditures for specific purposes.

The Public Safety Special Revenue Fund is used to account for the proceeds of a ½ cent sales and use tax that is legally restricted to expenditures for specific purposes.

Additionally, the City reports the following fund types:

#### Special revenue funds

Special revenue funds are used to account for the proceeds of specific revenue sources (other than expendable trusts or major capital projects) that are legally restricted to expenditures for specific purposes.

#### Debt service funds

Debt service funds are used to account for the accumulation of resources for, and the payment of, general long-term debt principal, interest, and related costs.

#### Capital projects funds

Capital projects funds are used to account for financial resources to be used for the acquisition or construction of major capital facilities (other than those financed by proprietary funds and trust funds),

#### Proprietary Funds -

Proprietary funds are used to account for ongoing organizations and activities that are similar to those often found in the private sector. The measurement focus is based upon the determination of net income, financial position, and cash flows. The following are the City's proprietary fund types:

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### Enterprise funds

Enterprise funds are used to account for operations (a) that are financed and operated in a manner similar to private business enterprises - where the intent of the governing body is that the costs (expenses, including depreciation) of providing goods or services to the general public on a continuing basis be financed or recovered primarily through user charges; or (b) where the governing body has decided that periodic determination of revenues earned, expenses incurred, and/or net income is appropriate for capital maintenance, public policy, management control, accountability, or other purposes. The City's enterprise funds are the Sewer Fund and the Water Fund.

#### C. Measurement Focus/Basis of Accounting

Measurement focus is a term used to describe "which" transactions are recorded within the various financial statements. Basis of accounting refers to "when" transactions are recorded regardless of the measurement focus applied.

#### Measurement Focus

On the government-wide statement of net assets and the statement of activities, both governmental and business-type activities are presented using the economic resources measurement focus as defined in item b. below.

In the fund financial statements, the "current financial resources" measurement focus or the "economic resources" measurement focus is used as appropriate:

- a. All governmental funds utilize a "current financial resources" measurement focus. Only current financial assets and liabilities are generally included on their balance sheets. Their operating statements present sources and uses of available spendable financial resources during a given period. These funds use fund balance as their measure of available spendable financial resources at the end of the period.
- b. The proprietary fund utilizes an "economic resources" measurement focus. The accounting objectives of this measurement focus are the determination of operating income, changes in net assets (or cost recovery), financial position, and cash flows. All assets and liabilities (whether current or noncurrent) associated with their activities are reported. Proprietary fund equity is classified as net assets.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### Basis of Accounting

In the government-wide statement of net assets and statement of activities, both governmental and business-type activities are presented using the accrual basis of accounting. Under the accrual basis of accounting, revenues are recognized when earned and expenses are recorded when the liability is incurred or economic asset used. Revenues, expenses, gains, losses, assets, and liabilities resulting from exchange and exchange-like transactions are recognized when the exchange takes place.

Governmental fund financial statements are reported using the current financial resources measurement focus and the modified accrual basis of accounting. Revenues are recognized as soon as they are both measurable and available. Revenues are considered to be available when they are collectible within the current period or soon enough thereafter to pay liabilities of the current period. For this purpose, the government considers revenues to be available if they are collected within 60 days of the end of the current fiscal period. Expenditures (including capital outlay) generally are recorded when a liability is incurred, as under accrual accounting. However, debt service expenditures are recorded only when payment is due.

The proprietary funds utilize the accrual basis of accounting. Under the accrual basis of accounting, revenues are recognized when earned and expenses are recorded when the liability is incurred or economic asset used.

#### Program revenues

Program revenues included in the Statement of Activities are derived directly from the program itself or from parties outside the City's taxpayers or citizenry, as a whole; program revenues reduce the cost of the function to be financed from the City's general revenues.

#### Allocation of indirect expenses

The City reports all direct expenses by function in the Statement of Activities. Direct expenses are those that are clearly identifiable with a function. Indirect expenses of other functions are not allocated to those functions, but are reported separately in the Statement of Activities. Depreciation expense is specifically identified by function and is included in the direct expense of each function. Interest on general long-term debt is considered an indirect expense and is reported separately on the Statement of Activities.

When both restricted and unrestricted resources are available for use, it is the City's policy to use restricted resources first, then unrestricted resources as they are needed.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### D. Assets, Liabilities and Equity

Cash, interest-bearing deposits, and investments

For purposes of the statement of net assets, cash and interest-bearing deposits include all demand accounts, savings accounts, and certificates of deposits of the City.

Under state law, the City may deposit funds within a fiscal agent bank organized under the laws of the state of Louisiana, the laws of any other state in the union, or the laws of the United States of America. The City may invest in certificates and time deposits of state banks organized under Louisiana laws and national banks having principal offices in Louisiana.

For the purpose of the proprietary funds statement of cash flows, "cash and cash equivalents" include all demand and savings accounts, and certificates of deposit or short-term investments with an original maturity of three months or less.

#### Receivables

In the government-wide statements, receivables consist of all revenues earned at year-end and not yet received. Major receivable balances for the governmental activities include ad valorem and sales and use taxes. Business-type activities report customer's utility service receivables as their major receivables. Uncollectible ad valorem taxes or utility service receivables are recognized as bad debts at the time information becomes available which would indicate the uncollectibility of the particular receivable. The allowance for customers' utility receivables was \$78,348 at June 30, 2011. Unbilled utility service receivables resulting from utility services rendered between the date of meter reading and billing and the end of the month, are recorded at year-end.

#### Interfund receivables and payables

During the course of operations, numerous transactions occur between individual funds that may result in amounts owed between funds. Those related to goods and services type transactions are classified as "due to and from other funds." Short-term interfund loans are reported as "interfund receivables and payables."

Long-term interfund loans (noncurrent portion) are reported as "advances from and to other funds." Interfund receivables and payables between funds within governmental activities are eliminated in the statement of net assets.

#### Inventory

Inventories are valued at cost, which approximates market value, using the first-in/first-out (FIFO) method. All inventories are accounted in the General Fund as assets when purchased and recorded as expenditures when consumed. Inventory items consumed by other funds are recorded through the interfund receivable/payable accounts.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### Prepaid Items

Payments made to vendors for services that will benefit periods beyond June 30, 2011, are recorded as prepaid items.

#### Restricted Assets

Restricted assets include cash and interest-bearing deposits of the proprietary funds that are legally restricted as to their use. The restricted assets in the sewer and water utility funds are related to the utility meter deposits and revenue bond accounts.

#### Capital Assets

Capital assets, which include property, plant, equipment, and infrastructure assets, are reported in the applicable governmental or business-type activities columns in the government-wide or financial statements. Capital assets are capitalized at historical cost or estimated cost if historical is not available. Donated assets are recorded as capital assets at their estimated fair market value at the date of donation. The City maintains a threshold level of \$1,000 or more for capitalizing capital assets.

The costs of normal maintenance and repairs that do not add to the value of the asset or materially extend assets lives are not capitalized. Prior to July 1, 2001, governmental funds' infrastructure assets were not capitalized. These assets have been valued at estimated historical cost.

Depreciation of all exhaustible capital assets is recorded as an allocated expense in the statement of activities, with accumulated depreciation reflected in the statement of net assets. Depreciation is provided over the assets' estimated useful lives using the straight-line method of depreciation. The range of estimated useful lives by type of asset is as follows:

Buildings and improvements	20-40 years
Equipment and vehicles	5-10 years
Utility system and improvements	25-50 years
Infrastructure	20-40 <b>yea</b> rs

In the fund financial statements, capital assets used in governmental fund operations are accounted for as capital outlay expenditures of the governmental fund upon acquisition. Capital assets used in proprietary fund operations are accounted for the same as in the government-wide statements.

#### Long-term debt

The accounting treatment of long-term debt depends on whether the assets are used in governmental fund operations or proprietary fund operations and whether they are reported in the government-wide or fund financial statements.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

All long-term debt to be repaid from governmental and business-type resources are reported as liabilities in the government-wide statements. The long-term debt consists primarily of the public improvement bonds payable, revenue bonds payable, compensated absences, net other post employment benefits and utility meter deposits payable.

Long-term debt for governmental funds is not reported as liabilities in the fund financial statements. The debt proceeds are reported as other financing sources and payment of principal and interest reported as expenditures. The accounting for proprietary fund long-term debt is the same in the fund statements as it is in the government-wide statements.

#### Compensated Absences

Sick leave is earned at the rate of one day for each month worked, with a limit of twelve days per year. One-third of accumulated sick leave up to 80 days is payable at termination of employment. Vacation leave is earned over a calendar year basis at an amount dependent upon years of service. Accumulated vacation time up to 160 hours is payable at termination of employment.

For fund financial statements, vested or accumulated leave that is expected to be liquidated with expendable available financial resources is reported as an expenditure and a current fund liability of the governmental fund that will pay it. In the government-wide statements, amounts of vested or accumulated leave that are not expected to be liquidated with expendable available financial resources are recorded as long-term debt.

#### Equity Classifications

In the government-wide statements, equity is classified as net assets and displayed in three components:

- a. Invested in capital assets, net of related debt Consists of capital assets including restricted capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and reduced by the outstanding balances of any bonds, mortgages, notes, or other borrowings that are attributable to the acquisition, construction, or improvement of those assets.
- b. Restricted net assets Consists of net assets with constraints placed on the use either by (1) external groups such as creditors, grantors, contributors, or laws or regulations of other governments; or (2) law through constitutional provisions or enabling legislation.
- c. Unrestricted net assets All other net assets that do not meet the definition of "restricted" or "invested in capital assets, net of related debt."

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

In the fund statements, governmental fund equity is classified as fund balance. Fund balance reports aggregate amounts for five classifications based on the constraints imposed on the use of these resources. As such, fund balances of the governmental funds are classified as follows.

- Nonspendable amounts that cannot be spent either because they are in nonspendable form or because they are legally or contractually required to be maintained intact.
- b. Restricted amounts that can be spent only for specific purposes because of constitutional provisions or enabling legislation or because of constraints that are externally imposed by creditors, grantors, contributors, or the laws or regulations of other governments.
- c. Committed amounts that can be used only for specific purposes determined by a formal decision of the City's Mayor and Council, which is the highest level of decision-making authority for the Village.
- d. Assigned amounts that do not meet the criteria to be classified as restricted or committed but that are intended to be used for specific purposes.
- e. Unassigned all other spendable amounts.

When an expenditure is incurred for the purposes for which both restricted and unrestricted fund balance is available, the City considers restricted funds to have been spent first. When an expenditure is incurred for which committed, assigned, or unassigned fund balances are available, the City considers amounts to have been spent first out of committed funds, then assigned funds, and finally unassigned funds, as needed, unless the City has provided otherwise in its commitment or assignment actions.

Proprietary fund equity is classified the same as in the government-wide statements.

#### E. Revenues, Expenditures, and Expenses

#### Operating Revenues and Expenses

Operating revenues and expenses for proprietary funds are those that result from providing services and producing and delivering goods and/or services. It also includes all revenue and expenses not related to capital and related financing, noncapital financing, or investing activities.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### Expenditures/Expenses

In the government-wide financial statements, expenses are classified by function for both governmental and business-type activities.

In the fund financial statements, expenditures are classified as follows:

Governmental Funds - By Character Proprietary Fund - By Operating and Nonoperating

In the fund financial statements, governmental funds report expenditures of financial resources. Proprietary funds report expenses relating to use of economic resources.

#### Interfund Transfers

Permanent reallocations of resources between funds of the reporting entity are classified as interfund transfers. For the purposes of the statement of activities, all interfund transfers between individual governmental funds have been eliminated.

#### F. Revenue Restrictions

The City has various restrictions placed over certain revenue sources from state or local requirements. The primary restricted revenue sources include:

Revenue Source	Legal Restrictions of Use	Legal Restrictions of Use				
Ad valorem taxes	See Note 2					
Sales tax	See Note 3					
Sewer and sewer revenue	Utility operations					

The City uses unrestricted resources only when restricted resources are fully depleted.

#### G. Budget and Budgetary Accounting

The City follows these procedures in establishing the budgetary data reflected in the financial statements:

- 1. The City Administrator prepares a proposed operating budget for the fiscal year and submits it to the Mayor and Council not later than May 15<sup>th</sup> of each fiscal year.
- 2. A summary of the proposed budget is published and the public notified that the proposed budget is available for public inspection. At the same time, a public hearing is called.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

- 3. A public hearing is held on the proposed budget at least ten days after publication of the call for the hearing.
- 4. After the holding of the public hearing and completion of all action necessary to finalize and implement the budget, the budget is adopted prior to the commencement of the fiscal year for which the budget is being adopted but no later than June 15<sup>th</sup> of each fiscal year.
- Budgetary amendments involving the transfer of funds from one department, program or function to another or involving increases in expenditures resulting from revenues exceeding amounts estimated require the approval of the Council.
- 6. All budgetary appropriations lapse at the end of each fiscal year.
- 7. Budgets for all funds are adopted on a basis consistent with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). Budgeted amounts are as originally adopted or as amended by the Council. Such amendments were not material in relation to the original appropriations.

#### H. <u>Use of Estimates</u>

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenditures during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

#### I. Report Reclassifications

Certain previously reported amounts for the year ended June 30, 2010 have been reclassified to conform to the June 30, 2011 classifications.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### (2) Ad Valorem Taxes

Ad valorem taxes attach as an enforceable lien on property as of January 1 of each year. Taxes are levied by the City in September or October and are actually billed to taxpayers in December. Billed taxes become delinquent on January 1 of the following year. The City bills and collects its own property taxes. Property tax revenues are recognized when levied to the extent that they result in current receivables.

For the year ended June 30, 2011, taxes of 17.76 mills were levied on property with assessed valuations totaling \$39,724,540 and were dedicated as follows:

General maintenance	5.16 mills
Street improvements	4.10 mills
Sewer system	4.25 mills
Sewer District III	4.25 mills
Total	<u>17.76</u> mills

Total taxes levied were \$705,508. There is no receivable recorded for taxes receivable at June 30, 2011 due to immateriality.

#### (3) Sales and Use Tax

A. Proceeds of the 1% sales and use tax levied by the City of Leesville beginning July 1, 2005 (2011 collections \$2,809,232) are dedicated for the following purposes in the following order:

Constructing, improving, extending, and maintaining streets, sidewalks, bridges, drains, subsurface drainage, sewers and sewerage disposal works; fire department stations and facilities; and public parks and recreational facilities, and purchased and acquiring the necessary land, equipment and furnishings for any of the aforesaid public works, improvements and facilities.

B. Proceeds of the 1/2% sales and use tax levied by the City of Leesville beginning April 1, 2004 (2011 collections \$1,206,729) are dedicated to the following purposes:

For improving, operating, and maintaining the public safety services within the City of Leesville, specifically, to provide funds to acquire necessary police and fire protection equipment and other facilities so as to increase the level of services and protection in the City.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### (4) <u>Cash, Interest-Bearing Deposits</u>

Under state law, the City may deposit funds within a fiscal agent bank organized under the laws of the State of Louisiana, the laws of any other state in the Union, or the laws of the United States. The City may invest in direct obligations of the United States government, bonds, debentures, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issued or guaranteed by federal agencies and/or the United States government, and time certificates of deposit of state banks organized under Louisiana law and national banks having principal offices in Louisiana. At June 30, 2011, the City had cash and interest-bearing deposits (book balances) totaling \$1,488,101 as follows

Demand deposits	\$ 313,547
Money market accounts	1,174,554
Total	\$ 1,488,101

These deposits are stated at cost, which approximates market. Custodial credit risk for deposits is the risk that in the event of the failure of a depository financial institution, the City's deposits may not be recovered or will not be able to recover the collateral securities that are in the possession of an outside party. Under state law, deposits (or the resulting bank balances) must be secured by federal deposit insurance or the pledge of securities owned by the fiscal agent bank. The market value of the pledged securities plus the federal deposit insurance must at all times equal the amount on deposit with the fiscal agent bank. These securities are held in the name of the pledging fiscal agent bank in a holding or custodial bank that is mutually acceptable to both parties:

Bank balances	\$ 1,670,236
Insured	\$ 1,000,456
Uninsured and collateral held by pledging bank not in City's name	669,780
Total	<u>\$ 1,670,236</u>

Pledged securities in the amount of \$669,780 were exposed to custodial credit risk. These securities include uninsured or unregistered investments for which the securities are held by the bank, or by its trust department or agent, but not in the City's name. Even though the pledged securities are considered uncollateralized (Category 3), Louisiana Revised Statute 39:1229 imposes a statutory requirement on the custodial bank to advertise and sell the pledged securities within 10 days of being notified by the City that the fiscal agent has failed to pay deposited funds upon demand. The City does not have a policy for custodial credit risk

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### (5) Receivables

Receivables at June 30, 2011 of \$926,066 consist of the following:

	Governmental Activities	Business-Type Activities	Total	
Accounts, net	<del>-</del> -	\$111,694	\$ 111,694	
Unbilled utility	-	267,277	267,277	
Sales tax	385,046	-	385,046	
Franchise tax	101,209	-	101,209	
Licenses and permits	40,319	-	40,319	
Other	20,521		20,521	
Totals	\$ 547,095	\$ 378,971	\$ 926,066	

#### (6) <u>Due from Other Governmental Units</u>

Amounts due from other governmental units of \$257,691 at June 30, 2011 consisted of the following:

#### Governmental activities:

State of Louisiana - beer tax revenues receivable	\$ 3,816
State of Louisiana Division of Historic Preservation - Main Street Program	13,500
Department of Justice - COPS Hiring Recovery Program	13,301
Business-type activities:	
State of Louisiana - water & sewer line extension grant	
Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality -	191,360
amount due for purchase of Sewer Revenue Bonds (see Note 10)	35,714
Total	\$ 257,691

#### (7) Restricted Assets

Restricted assets in the Enterprise Sewer and Water Funds consisted of the following at June 30, 2011:

Customers' deposits	\$ 242,357
Revenue bond reserve and sinking funds	79,198
Total enterprise utility fund restricted assets	<u>\$ 321,555</u>

# Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

# (8) <u>Capital Assets</u>

Capital asset activity for the year ended June 30, 2011 was as follows:

		Balance 07/01/10	A	dditions	D	eletions		Balance 6/30/11
Governmental activities:								
Capital assets not being depreciated:								
Land	\$	303,856	\$	•	\$	-	\$	303,856
Construction in progress		32,767		47,330		32,767		47,330
Other capital assets:								
Buildings and improvements		1,099,352		-		•	1	1,099,352
Equipment and vehicles		5,781,024		91,854		•		5,872,878
Infrastructure	2	22,013,488		32,767	_		2	2,046,255
Totals	3	39,230,487		171,951		32,767	3	9,369,671
Less accumulated depreciation				<del></del>				
Buildings and improvements		3,808,040		285,288		-		4,093,328
Equipment and vehicles		4,111,254		340,744		-		4,451,998
Infrastructure	į	4,767,392		372,739		-		5,140,131
Total accumulated depreciation		22,686,686	_	998,771	_	<u> </u>		3,685,457
Governmental activities,								
capital assets, net	\$ 1	16,543,801	\$	(826,820)	<u>\$</u>	32,767	<b>\$</b> 1	5,684,214
Business-type activities:								
Capital assets not being depreciated:								
Land	\$	157,249	\$	-	\$	•	\$	157,249
Construction in progress		61,431		1,141,630		858,283		344,778
Other capital assets:								
Plant and system	2	20,126,521		871,408		-	2	0,997,929
Equipment and vehicles		500,761		<b>7,8</b> 87				508,648
Totals	2	20,845,962	:	2,020,925		858,283	2	2,008,604
Less accumulated depreciation								
Plant and system		9,502,924		591,715		-	1	0,094,639
Equipment and vehicles		456,301		19,254		•		475,555
Total accumulated depreciation		9,959,225		610,969			1	0,570,194
Business-type activities,								
capital assets, net	\$ 1	0,886,737	\$	1,409,956	<u>\$</u>	858 <u>,</u> 283	<u>\$ 1</u>	1,438,410

(continued)

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

# (8) Capital Assets (Continued)

Depreciation expense was charged to governmental activities as follows:

General government	<b>\$ 6,446</b>
Public safety	271,887
Public works	180,213
Economic development	428,466
Culture and recreation	111,759
Total depreciation expense	<u>\$ 998,771</u>
Depreciation expense was charged to business-type activities as follows:	
Sewer	\$ 236,400
Water	374,569
Total depreciation expense	\$ 610,969

#### (9) Accounts and Other Payables

The accounts and other payables consisted of the following at June 30, 2011:

	Governmental Activities	Business-Type Activities	Total
Accounts payable	\$ 320,832	\$ 84,471	\$ 405,303
Salaries payable	61,7 <b>36</b>	14,286	76,022
Payroll tax and employee benefits payable	45,665	-	45,665
Contracts and retainage payable		66,864	66,864
Totals	\$ 428,233	<u>\$ 165,621</u>	\$ 593 <u>,854</u>

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

# (10) Changes in Long-Term Debt

The following is a summary of bonds, notes payable, capital leases and compensated absences transactions of the City for the year ended June 30, 2011:

	Balance 7/1/2010	Additions	Deletions	Balance 6/30/2011	Amount due in one year
Revenue bonds	\$ 4,218,834	\$ -	\$ 978,120	\$ 3,240,714	\$ 270,714
General obligation bonds	3,070,000	-	495,000	2,575,000	515,000
Note payable	497,377	-	-	497,377	38,401
Capital leases	1,085,923	-	158,734	927,189	153,742
Compensated absences	479,380	-	189,844	289,536	-
OPEB obligation	1,225,813	_1,168,980		2,394,793	
	\$10,577,327	\$1,168,980	<u>\$ 1,821,698</u>	\$ 9,924,609	\$ 977,857

Bonds payable at June 30, 2011 are comprised of the following individual issues:

#### Governmental activities:

# General obligation bonds:

\$255,000 Excess Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2002A, due in annual of installments of \$20,000 - \$30,000 through August 1, 2012; interest at 4.95 percent, secured by excess annual revenues of the General Fund	\$ 60,000
\$375,000 Excess Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2002B, due in annual installments of \$30,000 - \$50,000 through August 1, 2012; interest at 0.10 - 6.50 percent, secured by excess annual revenues of the General Fund	95,000
\$1,800,000 General Obligation Bonds, Series 2004, due in annual installments of \$85,000 - \$165,000 through February 1, 2019; interest at 4.40 - 3.63 percent, secured by ad valorem tax collections	
Revenue bonds:	1,280,000
\$2,500,000 Sales Tax Revenue Public Improvement Bonds, Series 2005 due in annual installments of \$75,000 - \$230,000 through August 1, 2020; interest at 3.10 - 4.25 percent; secured by sales tax collections	1 995 000
Total bonds applicable to governmental activities	1,885,000 \$ 3,165,000
	(continued)

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### (10) Changes in Long-Term Debt (Continued)

#### **Business-type activities**

#### General obligation bonds:

\$320,000 Excess Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2002C, due in annual installments of \$25,000 - \$40,000 through August 1, 2012; interest at 0.10 - 5.50 percent, secured by excess annual revenues of the Sewer Fund

75,000

\$4,710,000 General Obligation Bonds, Series, 1995 of the City of Leesville and General Obligation Bonds, Series 1995 of Sewer District No. 3, due in annual installments of \$190,000 - \$320,000 through March 15, 2015; interest at 2.45 percent, secured by ad valorem tax collections

1,220,000

<u>1,295,000</u>

#### Revenue bonds:

\$1,550,000 Water Improvement Bond, Series 2007, due in annual installments of \$75,000 - \$140,000 through August 1, 2022; interest at 0.10 - 4.70 percent; secured by Water Fund revenues

1,320,000

\$850,000 Sewer Revenue Bond, Scries 2009, non-interest bearing bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, and installing improvements, extensions and additions to the sewerage system of the City. The bonds were sold to the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Municipal Facilities Revolving Loan Fund (the "Department"). The City's obligation to repay the principal of the bonds will be forgiven simultaneously with the payment by the Department of each installment of the purchase price of the bonds. At the time of the debt forgiveness, these amounts are recognized as grant revenue.

35,714

1,355,714

Total bonds applicable to business-type activities

\$ 2,650,714

#### Capital leases payable at June 30, 2011:

	•	Original	Maturity	Interest	I	Balance
		Amount	Date	Rates	Ot	itstanding
Police equipment	\$	159,583	09/01/12	6.10%	\$	35,791
Fire equipment		666,583	04/25/28	4.98%		596,523
Public works equipment		55,967	05/05/13	4.00%		14,818
Police vehicles		392,000	01/25/15	4.10%	_	280,057
	\$	1,274,133			\$	927,189
					(con	tinued)

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

# (10) Changes in Long-Term Debt (Continued)

Annual debt service requirement of bonds outstanding are as follows:

	Gove	mmenta	al Activities	<u>B</u>	usiness-Typ	e A	<u>ctivities</u>		<u>Tc</u>	tal	
Year ending	Princ	ipal	Interest	P	rincipal	1	nterest	P	rincipal		Interest
June 30,	payn	nents	payments	P	ayments	_pa	yments	P	ayments	Р	ayments
2012	\$ 34	0,000	\$ 120,095	\$	445,714	\$	92,110	\$	785,714	\$	212,205
2013	36	5,000	105,461		430,000		79,293		795,000		184,754
2014	29	5,000	92,421		405,000		66,449		700,000		158,870
2015	31	0,000	81,328		415,000		53,979		725,000		135,307
2016	33	0,000	69,581		100,000		40,758		430,000		110,339
2017-2021	1,52	5,000	149,206		580,000		132,748	2	2,105,000		281,954
2022-2023		-		_	275,000	_	13,009	_	275,000		13,009
Total	\$ 3,16	5,000	\$ 618,092	<u>\$ :</u>	2,650,714	<u>\$</u>	478,346	\$ 5	5,815,714	<b>\$</b> 1	,096,438

Annual debt service requirements to maturity for the capital leases are as follows:

Year Ending				
June 30	Principal	Interest	Total	
2012	\$ 155,742	\$ 41,327	\$ 197,069	
2013	107,724	35,224	142,948	
2014	112,438	30,511	142,949	
2015	65,515	26,118	91,633	
2016	30,624	24,355	54,979	
2017 - 2021	178,188	97,006	275,194	
2022 - 2026	226,840	48,054	274,894	
2027	50,118	2,608	52,726	
	\$ 927,189	\$ 305,203	\$ 1,232,392	

Leased equipment and vehicles under capital lease in capital assets at June 30, 2011 include the following:

Equipment and vehicles	<b>\$</b> 1,34 <b>4</b> ,375
Less: Accumulated depreciation	(511,786)
Total	\$ 832,589

Amortization of leased equipment and vehicles under capital assets is included with depreciation expense.

(continued)

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### (10) Changes in Long-Term Debt (Continued)

Notes Payable:

On July 23, 2003, the City entered into an agreement with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development for utility relocation assistance funding. Issuance of future permits to the City by the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development for location of additional longitudinal facilities within any state owned right of way is contingent upon repayment of this funding. The City must show a good faith effort to repay the debt by making annual payments to the Department of Transportation and Development of 5% of its gross income or 10% of its outstanding utility relocation assistance funding debt. The first payment must be made within one year of the date of invoicing to the City by the Department of Transportation and Development, and issuance of permits will remain suspended until the first payment is made. The City's payments are due by January 15th of each year. As of June 30, 2011, the City incurred \$535,778 in funding from this agreement. The relocation project was completed and had final inspection on July 13, 2010.

#### (11) Flow of Funds; Restrictions on Use

Business-type activities:

Sewer Fund -

#### A. General Obligation Bonds, Series 1995

Under the terms of the \$4,710,000 General Obligation Bonds, Series 1995 of the City of Leesville and General Obligation Bonds, Series 1995 of the Sewer District No. 3 of the City of Leesville, the City shall levy and collect annually ad valorem taxes pursuant to a special election held on November 8, 1997, in an amount sufficient to pay, when due, the principal and interest on the bonds. The tax shall be expended only for the purpose of paying promptly when due the principal and interest on the bonds.

#### General Obligation Bond Sinking Fund

The City is required to establish a separately identifiable fund or account to be designated the General Obligation Bond Sinking Fund. All monies from the collection of the ad valorem taxes shall be used solely to pay principal and interest on the bonds.

#### Sewer System Renewal and Replacement Fund

The City is required to establish a separately identifiable fund or account to be designated the Sewer System Renewal and Replacement Fund. The City is required to set aside into this fund, on or before the 20<sup>th</sup> day of each month of each year, beginning no later than the first full month after the loan closing, an amount equal to 5% of net revenues collected in the prior calendar month until the balance in the renewal and replacement fund equals to \$75,000. All monies in the renewal and replacement fund may be drawn on and used by the System for the purpose of paying the costs of any unusual and extraordinary maintenance and any improvements to the System, which will either enhance its revenue producing capacity or provide a higher degree of service. At June 30, 2011, the account balance was \$26,382, which was less than the required balance.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### B. Excess Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2002C

Under the terms of the \$320,000 Excess Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2002C, the City will maintain an excess revenue bond sinking fund in an amount to pay promptly and fully the principal of and interest on the bonds by transferring monthly payments on or before the 20<sup>th</sup> day of each month commencing in August 2002 a sum equal to 1/6<sup>th</sup> of the next interest payment due and 1/12<sup>th</sup> of the next principal due.

During the year ended June 30, 2011, the monthly sinking fund transfers were not made timely or in full as required by the agreement. At June 30, 2011, the account balance was \$-0-, which was less than the required balance.

#### Water Fund -

Water Improvement Bond, Series 2007

Under the terms of the \$1,550,000 Water Improvement Bonds, Series 2007, the City is required to maintain an excess revenue bond sinking fund in an amount to pay promptly and fully the principal of and interest on the bonds by transferring monthly payments on or before the 20<sup>th</sup> day of each month commencing in August 2002 a sum equal to 1/6<sup>th</sup> of the next interest payment due and 1/12<sup>th</sup> of the next principal due.

During the year ended June 30, 2011, the monthly sinking fund transfers were not made timely as required by the agreement. At June 30, 2011, the account balance was \$-0-, which was less than the required balance.

#### Governmental Activities:

#### A. Excess Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2002A and B

Under the terms of the \$255,000 Excess Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2002A and the \$375,000 Excess Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2002B, the City will maintain an excess revenue bond sinking fund in an amount to pay promptly and fully the principal of and interest on the bonds by transferring monthly payments on or before the 20<sup>th</sup> day of each month commencing in August 2002 a sum equal to 1/6<sup>th</sup> of the next interest payment due and 1/12<sup>th</sup> of the next principal due.

During the year ended June 30, 2011, the monthly sinking fund transfers were not made timely or in full as required by the agreement. At June 30, 2011, the account balance was \$2,103, which was less than the required balance.

Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### B. Sales Tax Revenue Public Improvement Bonds, Series 2005

Under the terms of the \$2,500,000 Sales Tax Revenue Public Improvement Bonds, Series 2005, the City will maintain a sales tax bond sinking fund sufficient in amount to pay promptly and fully the principal of and interest on the bonds by transferring from the sales tax fund monthly payments on or before the 20<sup>th</sup> day of each month commencing August 2005 a sum equal to 1/6<sup>th</sup> of the next interest payment due and 1/12<sup>th</sup> of the next principal payment due.

The City is also required to establish a sales tax bond reserve fund by transferring, immediately upon delivery of the bonds from bond proceeds, a sum equal to the lesser of (1) 10% of the original principal proceeds of the bonds or (2) the highest combined principal and interest requirements for any succeeding bond year on the bonds.

During the year ended June 30, 2011, the monthly sinking fund transfers were not made in full as required by the agreement. The City has not established separate bank accounts for the sales tax bond sinking fund and the sales tax bond reserve fund. One bank account is being used that contains the deposits for both the sales tax bond sinking fund and the sales tax reserve fund. At June 30, 2011 the account balance was \$253,360, which was less than the required balance.

#### (12) Post Retirement Health Care and Life Insurance Benefits

From an accrual accounting perspective, the cost of postemployment healthcare benefits should be associated with the periods in which the cost occurs, rather than in the future year when it will be paid. In adopting the requirements of GASB Statement No. 45 during the year ended June 30, 2010, the City began to recognize the cost of postemployment healthcare in the year when employee services are received, to report the accumulated liability from prior years, and to provide information useful in assessing potential demands on the City's future cash flows. Because the City adopted the requirements of GASB Statement No. 45 prospectively, recognition of the liability accumulated from prior years will be phased in over 30 years, commencing with the 2010 liability.

Plan Description: Employees who retire from the City with twenty (20) years of service, regardless of age, are eligible to continue health insurance coverage upon retirement. The plan is a single-employer defined benefit health care plan administered by the City. The City has the authority to establish and amend the benefit provisions of the plan. The plan does not issue a publicly available financial report.

Funding Policy: The City and retiree contribute the same percentage (approximately 78% and 22%, respectively) of the cost of the premiums for health insurance coverage. Claims paid by the City on behalf of retirees are recognized as an expenditure when incurred. The benefits are financed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Annual OPEB Cost: The City's annual other postemployment benefit (OPEB) cost is calculated based on the annual required contribution of the employer (ARC), an amount actuarially determined in accordance with the parameters of GASB Statement 45. The ARC represents a level of funding that, if paid on an ongoing basis, is projected to cover normal cost each year and amortize any unfunded actuarial liabilities over a period not to exceed thirty years. The amortization of the unfunded actuarial accrued liability is calculated assuming 30 level annual payments.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

The following table shows the components of the City's annual OPEB cost for the year, the amount actually contributed to the plan, and changes in the district's net OPEB obligation:

Annual required contribution	\$ 1,385,765
Interest on net OPEB obligation	49,033
Adjustment to annual required contribution	(70,889)
Annual OPEB cost (expense)	1,363,909
Contributions made	(194,929)
Increase in net OPEB obligation	1,168,980
Net OPEB obligation - beginning of year	1,225,813
Net OPEB obligation - end of year	\$ 2,394,793

The City's annual OPEB cost, the percentage of annual OPEB cost contributed to the plan, and the net OPEB obligation for 2010 follows:

Fiscal	Annual	Percentage of	
Year	OPEB	Annual OPEB	Net OPEB
Ended	Cost	Cost Contributed	Obligation
6/30/2010	\$ 1,385,765	11.54%	\$ 1,225,813
6/30/2011	1,363,909	1 <b>4.29%</b>	2,394,793

The net OPEB benefit payable balance of \$2,394,793 is included in the statement of net assets in noncurrent liabilities. Of this amount, \$1,843,991 is applicable to governmental activities and \$550,802 is applicable to business-type activities.

Fiscal year 2010 was the year of implementation of GASB Statement No. 45 and the City elected to implement prospectively. Therefore, only two years of data is available. In future years, three-year trend information will be presented.

Funded Status and Funding Progress: The funded status of the plan as of July 1, 2009, was as follows:

Actuarial accrued liability (AAL)	\$	11,501,955
Actuarial valuation of plan assets	_	
Unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL)	<u>\$</u>	11,501,955
Funded ratio (actuarial value of plan assets/AAL)		0%
Covered payroll (active plan members)	\$	3,692,371
UAAL as a percentage of covered payroll		312%

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

Actuarial valuations for an ongoing plan involve estimates of the value of reported amounts and assumptions about the probability of occurrence of events far into the future. Actuarially determined amounts are subject to continuous revision as actual results are compared to past expectations and new estimates about the future are formulated. Although the valuation results are based on values which the City's actuarial consultant believes are reasonable assumptions, the valuation results reflect a long-term perspective and, as such, are merely an estimate of what future costs may actually be. Deviations in any of several factors, such as future interest rates, medical cost inflation, Medicare coverage, and changes in marital status, could result in actual costs being less or greater than estimated.

The schedule of funding progress presented as required supplementary information following the notes to the financial statements, will present multiyear trend information that shows whether the actuarial value of plan assets is increasing or decreasing over time relative to the actuarial accrued liabilities for benefits. Because 2010 was the year of implementation of GASB Statement No. 45 and the City elected to apply the statement prospectively, only one year is presented in the schedule at this time. In future years, required trend data will be presented.

Actuarial Methods and Assumptions: Projections of benefits for financial reporting purposes are based on the substantive plan (the plan as understood by the employer and plan members) and include the types of benefits provided at the time of each valuation and the historical pattern of sharing of benefit costs between the employer and plan members to that point. The actuarial methods and assumptions used include techniques that are designed to reduce short-term volatility in actuarial accrued liabilities and the actuarial value of assets, consistent with the long-term perspective of the calculations.

In the July 1, 2009 actuarial valuation, the unit credit actuarial cost method was used. The significant actuarial assumptions used in the valuation of the plan are as follows:

- 1. Discount rate for valuing liabilities: 4.0% per annum, compounded annually.
- 2. Retirement rates (Rates are the same for both male and female.)

_ Age	Rate
46 - 49	16.0%
50 - 54	7.0%
55 - 64	16.0%
65	26.0%

- 3. Mortality rates Healthy lives: RP-2000 projected to 2010 using scale AA.
- 4. 100% of employees who elect medical and prescription drug coverage while in active employment and who are eligible for retirce medical benefits are assumed to elect continued medical/prescription drug coverage in retirement.
- 5. 80% of future retirees are assumed to be married at retirement. Females are assumed to be three years younger than males, for active employees. Actual data was used for current retirees.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### 6. Medical and prescription drug inflation (trend assumption)

Year	Trend
2009	7.8%
2010	7.3%
2011	6.6%
2012-2015	6.1%
2016-2019	6.0%
2020-2025	5.9%
2026-2031	5.8%
2032-2033	5.7%
2034	5.6%
2035-2036	5.5%
2037-2038	5.4%
2039-2041	5.3%
2042-2046	5.2%
2047-2053	5.1%
2054-2062	5.0%
2063-2075	4.9%
2076	4.8%
2077-2078	4.6%
2079-2084	4.5%
2085 +	4.4%

#### (13) Employee Retirement

Substantially all employees of the City are members of the following statewide retirement systems: Municipal Employees Retirement System of Louisiana, Municipal Police Employees Retirement System of Louisiana, or Firefighters Retirement System of Louisiana. These systems are cost-sharing, multiple-employer defined benefit pension plans administered by separate boards of trustees. Pertinent information relative to each plan follows:

#### A. Municipal Employees Retirement System of Louisiana (System)

<u>Plan Description</u> - The System is composed of two distinct plans, Plan A and Plan B, with separate assets and benefit provisions. All employees of the municipality are members of Plan A.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

All permanent employees working at least 35 hours per week who are not covered by another pension plan and are paid wholly or in part from municipal funds and all elected municipal officials are eligible to participate in the System. Under Plan A, employees who retire at or after age 60 with at least 10 years of creditable service, at or after age 55 with at least 25 years of creditable service, or at any age with at least 30 years of creditable service are entitled to a retirement benefit, payable monthly for life, equal to 3% of their final-average salary for each year of creditable service. Final-average salary is the employee's average salary over the 36 consecutive or joined months that produce the highest average. Employees who terminate with at least the amount of creditable service stated above, and do not withdraw their employee contributions, may retire at the ages specified above and receive the benefit accrued to their date of termination. The System also provides death and disability benefits. Benefits are established or amended by state statute.

The System issues an annual publicly available financial report that includes financial statements and required supplementary information for the System. That report may be obtained by writing to the Municipal Employees Retirement System of Louisiana, 7937 Office Park Boulevard, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70809, or by calling (225) 925-4810.

Funding Policy - Under Plan A, members are required by state statute to contribute 9.25% of their annual covered salary and the City is required to contribute at an actuarially determined rate. The current rate is 14.25% of annual covered payroll. Contributions to the System also include one-fourth of 1% (except Orleans and East Baton Rouge parishes) of the taxes shown to be collectible by the tax rolls of each parish. These tax dollars are divided between Plan A and Plan B based proportionately on the salaries of the active members of each plan. The contribution requirements of plan members and the City are established and may be amended by state statute. As provided by R.S. 11:103, the employer contributions are determined by actuarial valuation and are subject to change each year based on the results of the valuation for the prior fiscal year. The City's contributions to the System for the years ending June 30, 2011, 2010, and 2009 were \$138,758, \$106,020, and \$130,347, respectively, equal to the required contributions for each year.

#### B. Municipal Police Employees Retirement System of Louisiana (System)

Plan Description - All full-time police department employees engaged in law enforcement are required to participate in the System. Employees who retire at or after age 50 with at least 20 years of creditable service or at or after age 55 with at least 12 years of creditable service are entitled to a retirement benefit, payable monthly for life, equal to 3 1/3% of their final-average salary for each year of creditable service. Final average salary is the employee's average salary over the 36 consecutive or joined months that produce the highest average. Employees who terminate with at least the amount of creditable service stated above, and do not withdraw their employee contributions, may retire at the ages specified above and receive the benefit accrued to their date of termination. The System also provides death and disability benefits. Benefits are established by state statute.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

The System issues an annual publicly available financial report that includes financial statements and required supplementary information for the System. That report may be obtained by writing to the Municipal Police Employees Retirement System of Louisiana, 8401 United Plaza Boulevard, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70809-2250, or by calling (225) 929-7411.

Funding Policy - Plan members are required by state statute to contribute 7.5% of their annual covered salary and the City is required to contribute at an actuarially determined rate. The current rate is 25% of annual covered payroll. The contribution requirements of plan members and the City are established and may be amended by state statute. As provided by R.S. 11:103, the employer contributions are determined by actuarial valuation and are subject to change each year based on the results of the valuation for the prior fiscal year. The City's contributions to the System for the years ending June 30, 2011, 2010, and 2009 were \$73,074, \$36,668, and \$33,065, respectively, equal to the required contributions for each year.

#### C. Firefighters' Retirement System of Louisiana

Plan Description - Membership in the Louisiana Firefighters' Retirement System is mandatory for all full-time firefighters employed by a municipality, parish, or fire protection district that did not enact an ordinance before January 1, 1980, exempting itself from participation in the System. Employees are eligible to retire at or after age 55 with at least 12 years of creditable service or at or after age 50 with at least 20 years of creditable service. Upon retirement, members are entitled to a retirement benefit, payable monthly for life, equal to 3 1/3% of their final-average salary for each year of creditable service, not to exceed 100% of their final-average salary. Final-average salary is the employee's average salary over the 36 consecutive or joined months that produce the highest average. Employees who terminate with at least 12 years of service and do not withdraw their employee contributions may retire at or after age 55 (or at or after age 50 with at least 20 years of creditable service at termination) and receive the benefit accrued to their date of termination. The System also provides death and disability benefits. Benefits are established or amended by state statute.

The System issues an annual publicly available financial report that includes financial statements and required supplementary information for the System. That report may be obtained by writing to the Firefighters' Retirement System, Post Office Box 94095, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804, or by calling (225) 925-4060.

Funding Policy - Plan members are required by state statute to contribute 8.0% of their annual covered salary and the City is required to contribute at an actuarially determined rate. The current rate is 21.5% of annual covered payroll. The contribution requirements of plan members and the City are established and may be amended by state statute. As provided by R.S. 11:103, the employer contributions are determined by actuarial valuation and are subject to change each year based on the results of the valuation for the prior fiscal year. The City's contributions to the System for the years ending June 30, 2011, 2010 and 2009 were \$92,251, \$62,914, and \$53,049, respectively, equal to the required contributions for each year.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### D. Defined Contribution Plan

The City sponsored a defined contribution pension plan (the Plan) to provide benefits at retirement to all full-time employees who elect to participate. Nationwide Retirement Solutions administers the Plan which was terminated by the City as of December 1, 2011. During the year ended June 30, 2011 there were 5 participants; however, 4 of these participants were terminated before June 30, 2011 and 1 employee became eligible for and transferred to another plan prior to June 30, 2011. At June 30, 2011, there were no active participants remaining in the Plan. Plan members were required to contribute 5% of their covered salary. The City was required to contribute 9% of the participant's covered salary. Plan provisions and contribution requirements are established by and may be amended by the City Council. The City's contribution to the Plan amounted to \$11,403 for the year ending June 30, 2011.

#### E. Social Security System

Employees of the City of Leesville who are not eligible to participate in any other retirement system are members of the Social Security System. The City and its employees contribute a percentage of each employee's salary to the System (7.65 percent contributed by the City; 7.65 percent contributed by the employee). The City's contributions during the years ending June 30, 2011 amounted to \$274,648.

#### (14) <u>Litigation and Claims</u>

At June 30, 2011, the City of Leesville was a defendant in several lawsuits. The City's legal counsel has reviewed the claims and lawsuits, in order to evaluate the likelihood of an unfavorable outcome to the City and to arrive at an estimate, if any, of the amount or range of potential loss to the City not covered by insurance. As a result of the review, there are no claims and lawsuits which might result in a liability to the City which are not considered coverable by insurance.

### (15) Risk Management

#### A. Commercial Insurance Coverage

The City is exposed to risks of loss in the areas of health care, general and auto liability, property hazards and workers' compensation. All of these risks are handled by purchasing commercial insurance coverage. There have been no significant reductions in the insurance coverage during the year.

#### B. Group Self-Insurance

The City has established a self-insurance health plan to account for and finance its uninsured risk of loss for commercial group health insurance. The plan is administered by Insurance Management Administrators, and the plan year ends on October 31 of each year. Under this plan, Gerber Life Insurance Company agreed to reimburse the City for specific incurred claims related to any one covered employee or dependent which exceeds the retention by the City, which is \$50,000. Monthly payments are calculated based on the number of employees with single coverage

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

multiplied by a funding factor of \$521 and the number of employees with family coverage multiplied by a funding factor of \$1,364. The City currently funds the plan based upon the funding factors discussed above. The City also funds actual claims in incurred in excess of any aggregate retained in the plan.

The claims liability of \$160,687 reported at June 30, 2011 is based on the loss that is probable at the date of the financial statements and the amount of the loss that can be reasonably estimated. The City currently does not discount its claims liabilities,

Changes in the claims liability balance for the group health insurance plan are as follows:

	2011	2010
Claims liability, beginning	\$ 258,589	\$ 203,202
Current year claims and changes in estimates	854,692	922,169
Benefit payments and claims	(952,594)	(866,782)
Claims liability, ending	\$ 160,687	\$ 258,589

Claims payable of \$160,687 at June 30, 2011 was determined as follows:

A.	Claims incurred prior to June 30, 2011 and paid	
	in July 1, 2011 through September 30, 2011	\$ 54,903
B.	Provision for claims reported but not processed	7
Ç.	Provision for claims incurred but not reported	105,777
	Total claims payable	\$ 160,687

The provision for claims incurred but not reported of \$105,777 was calculated utilizing historical information adjusted for current trends.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

# (16) <u>Compensation of City Officials</u>

A detail of compensation paid to the Mayor and Board of Aldermen for the year ended June 30, 2011 follows:

C. Robert Rose	\$ 11,708
Council Members:	
Willie Mae Kennedy	7,830
Milton D. Dowd	7,540
William M. Elliott	7,830
Patricia Martinez	7,366
Joseph P. McKee	7,337
Alice F. Guess	<u>7,540</u>
Total	\$ 57 <b>,1</b> 51

#### (17) Interfund Receivables/Payables

# A. A summary of interfund receivables and payables at June 30, 2011:

	Interfund Receivables	Interfund Payables	
Major governmental funds:			
General Fund	\$ 207,724	\$ 141,990	
Sales Tax Fund	•	270,799	
Public Safety Fund	63,075	-	
Non major governmental funds:			
Vernon Communication District	-	5,123	
Mainsteet Program Fund	-	13,500	
2004 GOB Street Improvements	160,613	· ·	
Total	<u>\$ 431,412</u>	\$ 431,412	

The amounts due to the Sales Tax Fund to various other funds are for short-term loans.

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

#### B. Transfers consisted of the following at June 30, 2011:

	Transfers In	Transfers Out
Major governmental funds:		
General Fund	\$ 947,725	\$ 748,457
Sales Tax Fund	-	2,226,453
Public Safety Fund	2,545,178	-
Non major governmental funds:		
Vernon Communication District	-	3,841
Mainstreet Program Fund	2,636	-
OEA Grant	4,542	-
Sales Tax Sinking Fund	38,079	-
2002 Certificates of Indebtedness	1,485	28,365
Airport Constsruction	6,659	-
LCDBG Economic Development	2	-
2005 P.I. Sales Tax Bonds	128	<u> </u>
Total governmental funds	3,546,434	3,007,116
Proprietary funds:		
Sewer Fund	40,828	-
Water Fund	<u> </u>	580,146
Total proprietary funds	40,828	580,146
Total	<b>\$</b> 3,587,262	\$ 3,587,262

Transfers are used to (a) move revenues from the fund that statute or budget requires to collect them to the fund that statute or budget requires to expend them and to (b) use unrestricted revenues collected in the general fund to finance various programs accounted for in other funds in accordance with budgetary authorizations.

#### (18) Excess of Expenditures Over Appropriations

The following fund incurred expenditures in excess of appropriations in the following amounts for the year ended June 30, 2011:

Public Safety Fund \$ 280,069

#### Notes to Financial Statements (Continued)

# (19) Prior Period Adjustment

Certain errors resulting in an overstatement of previously reported contracts and retainage payable were discovered during the current year. Accordingly, an adjustment of \$269,955 was made at June 30, 2011 to reduce contracts and retainage payable as of the beginning of the year and increase previously reported fund balance as shown below.

#### Major governmental fund:

General Fund -

Fund balance (deficit), previously reported Prior period adjustment	\$ (364,526) <u>269,955</u>
Fund balance (deficit), as restated	(94,571)

The error described above also resulted in an overstatement of previously reported infrastructure capital assets in Governmental Activities. Accordingly, an adjustment at June 30, 2011 of \$227,547 was made to reduce capital assets; \$1,422 to reduce accumulated depreciation and \$43,830 to increase previously reported net assets as shown below.

#### Governmental activites:

Net assets, previously reported	\$ 10,967,266
Prior period adjustment	43,830
Net assets, as restated	11,011,096

### (20) Subsequent Event Review

The City's management has evaluated subsequent events through December 16, 2011, the date which the financial statements were available to be issued.

REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

# Budgetary Comparison Schedule For the Year Ended June 30, 2011

				Variance with Final Budget
	Bud			Positive
_	Original	Final	Actual	(Negative)
Revenues:	_		_	
Taxes	\$ 746,085	\$ 711,085	\$ 760,173	\$ 49,088
Licenses and permits	442,065	457,065	472,869	15,804
Intergovernmental	21,780	23,000	26,982	3,982
Charges for services	155,155	161,722	268,025	106,303
Miscellaneous	99,360	98,855	<u>107,110</u>	<u>8,255</u>
Total revenues	1,464,445	1,451,727	1,635,159	183,432
Expenditures:				
Current:				
General government:				
General and administrative	617,584	514,755	431,733	83,022
Executive	94,347	94,716	77,573	17,143
Legal	22,358	38,520	33,737	4,783
Public works	891,098	893,327	897,362	(4,035)
Economic development	182,617	165,717	229,161	(63,444)
Debt service	-	-	21,116	(21,116)
Capital outlay	17,111	72,000	49,174	22,826
Total expenditures	1,825,115	1,779,035	1,739,856	39,179
Deficiency of revenues				
over expenditures	(360,670)	(327,308)	(104,697)	222,611
Other financing sources (uses):				
Transfers in	572,569	539,207	947,725	408,518
Transfers out	(117,328)	(117,328)	(748,457)	(631,129)
Total other financing sources (uses)	455,241	421,879	199,268	(222,611)
Excess of revenues and other sources over expenditures				
and other uses	94,571	94,571	94,571	-
Fund balance (deficit), beginning, as restated	(94,571)	(94,571)	(94,571)	
Fund balance (deficit), ending	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$ - </u>	\$ -

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA Sales Tax Special Revenue Fund

Budgetary Comparison Schedule For the Year Ended June 30, 2011

				Variance with	
	n 1			Final Budget	
•	Bud			Positive	
	Original	Final	Actual	(Negative)	
Revenues:					
Taxes	\$2,715,000	\$2,715,000	\$2,809,232	\$ 94,232	
Charges for services	73,265	98,760	78,865	(19,895)	
Miscellaneous	8,765	8,765	11,627	2,862	
Total revenues	2,797,030	2,822,525	2,899,724	<u>77,199</u>	
Expenditures:					
Current:					
General government	138,834	87,263	70,013	17,250	
Culture and recreation	409,425	461,082	456,725	4,357	
Capital outlay	30,000	25,000	1,528	23,472	
Total expenditures	<u>578,259</u>	573,345	528,266	45,079	
Excess of revenues					
over expenditures	2,218,771	2,249,180	2,371,458	122,278	
Other financing uses:					
Transfers out	(2,280,914)	(2,247,552)	(2,226,453)	21,099	
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over expenditures and					
other uses	(62,143)	1,628	145,005	143,377	
Fund balance, beginning	<u>453,496</u>	453,496	453,496	<del></del>	
Fund balance, ending	\$ 391,353	\$ 455,124	\$ 598,501	<u>\$ 143,377</u>	

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA Public Safety Special Revenue Fund

Budgetary Comparison Schedule For the Year Ended June 30, 2011

	Bud	get		Variance with Final Budget Positive
	Original	Final	Actual	(Negative)
Revenues:				
Taxes	\$1,357,500	\$1,376,676	\$ 1,206,729	\$ (169,947)
Intergovernmental	261,750	271,125	474,351	203,226
Fines and forfeitures	205,000	205,000	156,383	(48,617)
Charges for services	64,000	64,000	35,079	(28,921)
Miscellaneous	30,000	72,737	13,521	(59,216)
Total revenues	1,918,250	1,989,538	1,886,063	(103,475)
Expenditures:				
Current:				
Public Safety:				
Police	2,128,812	2,162,121	2,112,299	49,822
Fire	1,038,823	1,106,692	1,181,613	(74,921)
City Court	94,009	153,946	130,628	23,318
Debt service	-	•	188,278	(188,278)
Capital outlay		<del></del>	90,010	(90,010)
Total expenditures	3,261,644	3,422,759	3,702,828	(280,069)
Deficiency of revenues				
over expenditures	(1,343,394)	(1,433,221)	(1,816,765)	(383,544)
Other financing sources (uses):				
Transfers in	1,485,000	1,485,000	2,545,178	1,060,178
Transfers out		(15,630)		15,630
Total other financing sources (uses)	1,485,000	1,469,370	2,545,178	1,075,808
Excess of revenues and other sources over expenditures				
and other uses	141,606	36,149	728,413	692,264
Fund balance (deficit), beginning	(728,413)	(728,413)	(728,413)	<del></del>
Fund balance (deficit), ending	\$ (586,807)	\$ (692,264)	<u>s - </u>	\$ 692,264

# Schedule of Funding Progress For the Year Ended June 30, 2011

			Unfunded			
		Actuarial	<b>Actuarial</b>			Actuarial
Actuarial	Actuarial	Accrued	Accrued			Accrued
Valuation	Value of	Liabilities	Liabilities	Funded	Covered	Liabilities
Date	Assets	(AAL)	(UAAL)	Ratio	Payroll	(UAAL)
July 1, 2009	<b>\$</b> -	\$11,501,955	\$11,501,955	0.0%	\$3,692,371	312%

OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

# Statement of Net Assets June 30, 2011 With Comparative Totals for June 30, 2010

•					
	Governmental	Business-Type		2010	
	Activities	Activities	Total	Totals	
ASSETS					
Cash and interest-bearing deposits	\$ 926,291	\$ 240,255	<b>\$</b> 1,166,546	\$ 1,993,026	
Receivables	547,095	378,971	926,066	950,284	
Due from other governmental agencies	30,617	227,074	257,691	888,488	
Inventories	132,696	-	132,696	113,751	
Other assets	37,136	11,134	48,270	50,251	
Restricted assets:					
Cash and interest-bearing deposits	-	321,555	321,555	511,245	
Capital assets:					
Land and construction in progress	351,186	502,027	853,213	555,303	
Capital assets, net	15,333,028	10,936,383	26,269,411	26,875,235	
Total assets	17,358,049	12,617,399	29,975,448	31,937,583	
			<del></del>		
LIABILITIES					
Cash overdraft	-	-	-	798,399	
Accounts and other payables	428,233	165,621	593,854	768,504	
Claims payable	160,687	-	160,687	258,589	
Interest payable	58,519	36,074	94,593	106,313	
Long-term liabilities:					
Customer deposits payable	-	242,357	242,357	237,877	
Compensated absences payable	253,951	35,585	289,536	479,680	
OPEB obligation payable	1, <b>843,9</b> 91	550,802	2,394,793	1,225,813	
Bonds, notes, and leases due within one year	493,742	484,115	977,857	1,699,517	
Bonds, notes, and leases due after one year, net	3,598,447	2,663,976	6,262,423	7,172,617	
Total liabilities	6,837,570	4,178,530	11,016,100	12,747,309	
NET ASSETS					
Invested in capital assets, net of related debt	11,592,025	8,493,653	20,085,678	19,806,753	
Restricted for debt service	383,346	-	383,346	661,878	
Unrestricted (deficit)	(1,454,892)	(54,784)	(1,509,676)	(1,278,357)	
Total net assets	\$10,520,479	\$8,438,869	\$18,959,348	\$19,190,274	

# Budgetary Comparison Schedule - Revenues For the Year Ended June 30, 2011 With Comparative Actual Amounts for the Year Ended June 30, 2010

	2011				
			_	Variance with	
				Final Budget	
		dget		Positive	2010
	Original	Final	Actual	(Negative)	Actual
Taxes:					
Ad valorem	\$ 211,085	\$ 211,085	\$ 217,533	\$ 6,448	\$ 210,367
Franchise	535,000	500,000	542,640	42,640	496,170
Total taxes	746,085	711,085	760,173	49,088	706,537
Licenses and permits:					
Occupational licenses	406,545	406,545	443,535	36,990	458,180
Permits	35,520	50,520	29,334	(21,186)	53,801
Total licenses and permits	442,065	457,065	472,869	<u>15,804</u>	511,981
Intergovernmental:					
Federal grants -					
Federal Emergency Mgmt. Assistance	-	-	-	-	57,153
State of Louisiana -					
Beer taxes	21,780	23,000	22,193	(807)	25,686
Mainstreet grant			4,789	4,789	6,522
Total intergovernmental	21,780	23,000	26,982	<u>3,982</u>	89,361
Charges for services:					
Inspection fees	14,130	14,565	10,322	(4,243)	15,229
Airport hanger rent	20,000	24,382	20,109	(4,273)	25,126
Airport fuel sales	120,000	120,000	228,523	108,523	264,417
Miscellaneous	1,025	2,775	9,071	6,296	10,096
Total charges for services	155,155	161,722	268,025	106,303	314,868
Miscellaneous:					
Interest	1,645	1,645	768	(877)	<b>1,7</b> 51
Vídeo bingo	60,500	60,000	41,736	(18,264)	65,085
Other sources	37,215	<u>37,210</u>	64,606	27,396	36,829
Total miscellaneous	99,360	98,855	107,110	<u>8,255</u>	103,665
Total revenues	\$1,464,445	\$1,451,727	\$1,635,159	\$183,432	\$1,726,412

# Budgetary Comparison Schedule - Expenditures For the Year Ended June 30, 2011 With Comparative Actual Amounts for the Year Ended June 30, 2010

	2011					
	Buc	dget		Variance with Final Budget Positive	2010	
	Original Final		Actual	(Negative)	Actual	
Current;				(**- <u>B</u> /		
General government:						
General and administrative -						
Salaries and wages	\$ 53,310	\$ 63,833	\$ 46,172	\$ 17,661	\$ 54,406	
Payroll taxes	4,078	4,165	3,835	330	4,109	
Retirement contribution	7,729	8,033	4,107	3,926	6,838	
Hospitalization	14,407	60,000	39,396	20,604	77,522	
Insurance	137,313	182,912	102,552	80,360	136,707	
Materials and supplies	43,000	39,000	27,430	11,570	45,525	
Advertisements and recordings	9,400	9,800	13,217	(3,417)	9,820	
Accounting and auditing	15,000	25,000	81,065	(56,065)	19,215	
Miscellaneous	27,362	27,362	35,595	(8,233)	27,520	
Utilities and telephone	9,000	9,000	10,483	(1,483)	8,072	
Repairs and maintenance	31,465	41,450	36,177	5,273	42,226	
Dues	3,620	3,700	4,508	(808)	3,697	
Travel	3,000	-	1,342	(1,342)	3,130	
Uniforms	18,900	20,500	19,838	662	21,532	
Annexation related costs	240,000	20,000	6,016	13,984	248,775	
Total general and						
administrative	617,584	514,755	431,733	83,022	709,094	
Executive -						
Salaries	54,760	52,982	57,505	(4,523)	<b>54,8</b> 43	
Payroll taxes	4,298	4,185	5,103	(918)	4,047	
Retirement contribution	-	-	28	(28)	156	
Hospitalization	13,994	13,994	(3,534)	17,528	38,645	
Utilities and telephone	4,300	7,000	3,858	3,142	4,219	
Insurance	395	395	472	(77)	320	
Travel	7,500	7,500	7,469	31	7,202	
Public relations	2,500	2,500	1,083	1,417	2,439	
Vehicle expense	6,600	6,160	5,589	571	•	
Total executive	94,347	94,716	77,573	17,143	111,871	

(continued)

# Budgetary Comparison Schedule - Expenditures (continued) For the Year Ended June 30, 2011 With Comparative Actual Amounts for the Year Ended June 30, 2010

	2011				
	Budg	Det		Variance with Final Budget Positive	2010
	Original	Final	Actual	(Negative)	Actual
Legal -					
Salaries	15,000	30,000	26,933	3,067	15,000
Payroll taxes	1,178	2,340	2,602	(262)	1,170
Insurance	180	180	156	24	148
Legal fees	6,000	6,000	4,046	1,954	5,955
Total legal	22,358	38,520	33,737	4,783	22,273
Public works:					
Salaries	419,548	398,708	428,193	(29,485)	455,470
Payroll taxes	33,078	31,138	31,913	(775)	35,076
Retirement contribution	41,650	41,650	36,351	5,299	40,976
Hospitalization	49,480	80,000	43,092	36,908	99,115
Maintenance and supplies	139,000	133,100	133,357	(257)	316,580
Dumpster service	2,731	. 2,731	9,099	(6,368)	2,728
Utilities and telephone	85,000	85,000	94,651	(9,651)	89,554
Insurance	97,700	107,500	113,690	(6,190)	98,333
Miscellaneous	22,911	13,500	7,016	6,484	19,599
Total public works	891,098	893,327	897,362	(4,035)	1,157,431
Economic development -					
Salaries	30,920	30,920	21,683	9,237	31,148
Payroll taxes	2,410	2,410	1,861	549	2,404
Maintenance and supplies	14,042	9,042	9,085	(43)	14,071
Fuel	100,000	100,000	174,286	(74,286)	225,833
Utilities and telephone	17,500	17,500	18,279	(779)	17,708
Insurance	17,745	5,545	467	5,078	5,485
Miscellaneous	-	300	3,500	(3,200)	6,944
Farmers market					1,194
Total economic					
development	<u> 182,617</u>	165,717	229,161	(63,444)	304,787
					(continued)

# Budgetary Comparison Schedule - Expenditures (continued) For the Year Ended June 30, 2011 With Comparative Actual Amounts for the Year Ended June 30, 2010

2011 Variance with Final Budget Budget Positive 2010 Original Final Actual (Negative) Actual Group insurance: Insurance 157,090 (157,090)176,534 Claims paid 805,908 (805,908)890,513 Miscellaneous 48,785 (48,785)53,229 Less: premiums allocated to departments (1,011,783)1,011,783 (1,120,276)Debt service: Retirement of principal 19,903 (19,903)30,190 Interest and fiscal charges 1,213 (1,213) 2,334 Total debt service 21,116 (21,116)32,524 Capital outlay: 55,000 General government 47,330 7,670 1,850 Public works 17,111 17,000 1,844 15,156 27,896 Economic development 1,195 Total capital outlay 17,111 72,000 49,174 22,826 30,941 Total expenditures \$1,825,115 \$1,779,035 \$ 1,739,856 \$ 39,179 \$ 2,368,921

#### CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA Special Revenue Fund

# Sales Tax Special Revenue Fund

#### **Budgetary Comparison Schedule** For the Year Ended June 30, 2011

With Comparative Actual Amounts for the Year Ended June 30, 2010

	2011				
				Variance with Final Budget	
	Bud	get		Positive	2010
	Original	Final	· Actual	(Negative)	Actual
Revenues:					
Taxes	\$ 2,715,000	\$ 2,715,000	\$ 2,809,232	\$ 94,232	\$ 2,759,268
Charges for services	73,265	98,760	78,865	(19,895)	77,596
Miscellaneous	8,765	8,765	11,627	2,862	8,731
Total revenues	2,797,030	2,822,525	2,899,724	77,199	_2,845,595
Expenditures:					
Current -					
General government:					
Salaries and wages	19,851	14,140	13,130	1,010	21,171
Payroll taxes	1,625	1,131	1,141	(10)	1,625
Retirement contribution	-	-	-	•	843
Collection fees	53,850	53,850	46,842	7,008	<b>5</b> 0,145
Accounting and auditing	5,000	10,000	-	10,000	5,000
Park equipment	50,000	-	276	(276)	3,881
Miscellaneous	8,508	8,142	8,624	(482)	7,006
Total general government	138,834	87,263	70,013	17,250	89,671
Culture and recreation:					
Recreation department	224,077	209,061	192,503	16,558	227,896
Recreation complex	54,628	53,488	59,941	(6,453)	57,598
Neighborhood center	130,720	126,980	131,898	(4,918)	143,163
Leisure pool	<u>-</u>	71,553	72,383	(830)	77,332
Total culture and recreation	409,425	461,082	456,725	4,357	505,989
Capital outlay -					
Culture and recreation:					
Recreation department	20,000	20,000	1,528	18,472	35,802
Recreation complex	5,000	5,000	-	5,000	13,799
Neighborhood center	5,000	-	-		757
Leisure pool	-	_	-	-	_ 6,383
Total capital outlay	30,000	25,000	1,528	23,472	56,741
Total expenditures	578,259	573,345	528,266	45,079	652,401
Excess of revenues over				<del></del>	
expenditures	2,218,771	2,249,180	2,371,458	122,278	2,193,194
Other financing uses:					
Transfers out	(2,280,914)	(2,247,552)	(2,226,453)	21,099	(1,960,501)
Excess (deficiency) of revenues					
over expenditures and other uses	(62,143)	1,628	145,005	143,377	232,693
Fund balance, beginning	453,496	<u>453,496</u>	453,496	<u> </u>	220,803
Fund balance, ending	\$ 391,353	\$ 455,124	\$ 598,501	\$143,377	\$ 453,496

#### CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA Special Revenue Fund Public Safety Special Revenue Fund

# Budgetary Comparison Schedule For the Year Ended June 30, 2011 With Comparative Actual Amounts for the Year Ended June 30, 2010

	2011				
	Budget			Variance with Final Budget Positive	2010
	Original	Final	Actual	(Negative)	Actual
Revenues:					<b></b>
Taxes	\$ 1,357,500	\$ 1,376,676	\$ 1,206,729	\$ (169,947)	\$ 1,376,676
Intergovernmental	261,750	271,125	474,351	203,226	196,684
Fines and forfeitures	205,000	205,000	156,383	(48,617)	194,139
Charges for services	64,000	64,000	35,079	(28,921)	62,607
Miscellaneous	30,000	<u>72,737</u>	13,521	(59,216)	<u>72,391</u>
Total revenues	1,918,250	1,989,538	1,886,063	(103,475)	1,902,497
Expenditures:					
Current -					
Public safety:					
Police -					
Salaries and wages	1,236,204	1,220,799	1,203,364	17,435	1,310,596
Payroll taxes	93,395	85,658	106,761	(21,103)	101,741
Retirement contribution	78,591	75,396	42,137	33,259	45,594
Hospitalization	149,748	180,710	186,656	(5,946)	250,335
Insurance	150,750	148,100	177,755	(29,655)	135,552
Telephone and utilities	37,665	38,000	44,408	(6,408)	38,998
Maintenance and supplies	130,563	135,008	212,107	(77,099)	172,072
Collection fee	27,615	25,019	23,321	1,698	25,019
Equipment lease	148,702	148,702	9,050	139,652	29,118
Prisoner expense	25,000	25,000	33,118	(8,118)	28,363
Miscellaneous	50,579	79,729	73,622	6,107	61,876
Total police	2,128,812	2,162,121	2,112,299	49,822	2,199,264
Fire -					
Salaries and wages	598,131	626,547	593,764	32,783	622,762
Payroll taxes	46,500	42,731	48,250	(5,519)	48,190
Retirement contribution	83,520	83,520	109,159	(25,639)	63,801
Hospitalization	72,798	120,000	198,253	(78,253)	273,341
Insurance	106,000	104,000	113,401	(9,401)	96,002
Telephone and utilities	29,695	28,000	27,141	859	27,834
Maintenance and supplies	31,535	31,250	44,459	(13,209)	32,898
Miscellaneous	70,644	70,644	47,186	23,458	16,055
Total fire	1,038,823	1,106,692	1,181,613	(74,921)	1,180,883

(continued)

#### CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA Special Revenue Fund Public Safety Special Revenue Fund

# Budgetary Comparison Schedule (Continued) For the Year Ended June 30, 2011 With Comparative Actual Amounts for the Year Ended June 30, 2010

2011 Variance with Final Budget Budget Positive 2010 Original Final (Negative) Actual Actual Expenditures (continued): City Court -Salaries and wages 66,000 66,000 60,526 5,474 66,000 Payroll taxes 5,115 5,115 5,012 103 5,104 19,997 113,422 Hospitalization 15,063 75,000 55,003 Insurance 251 251 248 3 197 Miscellaneous 680 (680)7,580 7,580 Utilities 9,159 (1,579)7,541 Total city court 94,009 153,946 130,628 23,318 192,264 Debt service -Retirement of principal 138,742 (138,742)85,776 Interest and fiscal charges 49,536 (49,536)43,855 Total debt service 188,278 (188,278)129,631 Capital outlay -Public safety: Police 448,340 Fire 90,010 (90,010)90,010 Total capital outlay (90,010)448,340 Total expenditures 3,702,828 3,261,644 3,422,759 (280,069)4,150,382 Deficiency of revenues over expenditures (1,343,394) (1,433,221) (1,816,765) (2,247,885) (383,544)Other financing sources (uses): Transfers in 1,485,000 1,485,000 2,545,178 1,060,178 1,161,286 Transfers out (15,630)15,630 Proceeds from capital lease 392,000 Total other financing sources (uses) 1,485,000 1,469,370 2,545,178 1,075,808 1,553,286 Excess of revenues and other sources over exenditures and other uses 141,606 36,149 728,413 692,264 (694,599)Fund balance (deficit), beginning (728,413) (728,<u>413</u>) (728,413) (33,814)Fund balance (deficit), ending \$ (586,807) **\$** (692,264) \$ 692,264 \$ (728,413) NONMAJOR GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS

#### NONMAJOR GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS

#### **Special Revenue Funds**

Special revenue funds are used to account for specific revenues that are legally restricted to expenditures for particular purposes.

#### Vernon Communication District

To account for the operations of the Parish E911 service.

#### **Mainstreet Program Fund -**

To account for the activity to foster economic development and stimulate cultural tourism throughout the City's downtown area.

#### OEA Grant Fund -

To account for the receipt and use of proceeds of a grant from the Department of defense, Office of Economic Adjustment for Regional Growth Management.

#### **LCDBG Economic Development Fund -**

To account for the receipt and use of proceeds of a grant from the Louisiana Community Development Block Grant for economic development.

#### **Debt Service Funds**

Debt service funds are used to accumulate resources to be used to make debt service principal and interest payments on general obligation long-term debt.

#### Sales Tax Sinking Fund

To accumulate monies for payment of the \$2,500,000 Public Improvement Sales Tax Bonds, Series 2005. Debt service is financed by the collection of sales taxes.

#### 2002 Certificates of Indebtedness Fund

To accumulate monies for payment of the \$255,000 and \$375,000 Excess Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2002A and Series 2002B, due in annual installments, plus interest, through maturity in 2012. Payments are derived from excess revenues of the General Fund.

#### 2004 GOB Street Improvement Fund

To accumulate monies for payment of the \$1,800,000 General Obligation Bonds, Series 2004. Debt service is financed by the collection of ad valorem taxes.

(continued)

# NONMAJOR GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS (CONTINUED)

# **Capital Projects Funds**

Capital projects funds are used to accumulate resources to be used for the acquisition or construction of capital facilities.

#### **Airport Construction Fund -**

To account for improvements and rehabilitation costs associated with the City's airport which is funded by state and federal monies.

#### Louisiana Community Development Grant (LCDBG) Fund -

To account for repairs to the sewer lines within the City.

#### 2005 P.I. Sales Tax Bond Fund

To account for the receipt and use of proceeds of the Public Improvement Sales Tax Bond, Series 2005, and subsequent expenditure of the funds.

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA Nonmajor Governmental Funds

# Combining Balance Sheet June 30, 2011

	Special Revenue	Debt Service	Capital Projects	Total
ASSETS				
Cash and interest-bearing deposits  Due from other funds  Due from other governmental agencies	\$ 12,490 - 13,500	\$281,252 160,613	\$ 46 - -	\$ 293,788 160,613 13,500
Total assets	\$ 25,990	\$441,865	<u>\$ 46</u>	<u>\$467,901</u>
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES				
Liabilities:				
Due to other funds	\$ 18,623	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 18,623
Fund balances:				
Restricted for debt service	-	441,865	-	441,865
Assigned	<b>7,</b> 36 <u>7</u>		46	7,413
Total fund balances	7,367	441,865	46	449,278
Total liabilities and fund balances	\$ 25,990	<u>\$441,865</u>	<u>\$ 46</u>	<b>\$467,90</b> 1

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA Nonmajor Governmental Funds

# Combining Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances Year Ended June 30, 2011

	Special Revenue	Debt Service	Capital Projects	Total
Revenues:				
Taxes	\$ -	\$ 160,613	\$ -	\$ 160,613
Intergovernmental	54,957	-	-	54,957
Charges for services	456,024	-	-	456,024
Miscellancous	732	2,669	2	3,403
Total revenues	511,713	163,282	2	674,997
Expenditures:				
Current -				
General government	42,301	-	-	<b>42,30</b> 1
Public safety	535,073	-	-	535,073
Public works	35,351	-	84	35,435
Economic development	13	-	20	33
Debt service		460,829		460,829
Total expenditures	612,738	460,829	104	1,073,671
Deficiency of revenues				
over expenditures	(101,025)	(297,547)	(102)	(398,674)
Other financing sources (uses):				
Transfers in	7,178	39,564	6,789	53,531
Transfers out	(3,841)	(28,365)		(32,206)
Total financing sources (uses)	3,337	11,199	6,789	21,325
Excess (deficiency) of revenues and other sources over				
expenditures and other uses	(97,688)	(286,348)	6,687	(377,349)
Fund balances (deficit), beginning	105,055	728,213	(6,641)	826,627
Fund balances, ending	<u>\$ 7,367</u>	\$ 441,865	<u>\$ 46</u>	<u>\$ 449,278</u>

NONMAJOR SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS

CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA Nonmajor Special Revenue Funds

Combining Balance Sheet June 30, 2011

LCDBG	Mainstreet OEA Economic	Grant		\$ - \$7,367	•	\$13,500 \$ - \$ \$7,367 \$25,990			,	13,500			•	\$13,500 \$ - \$7,367 \$25,990
Vernon	ion	1		\$ 5,123	.{	\$ 5,123		, <del>63</del>	•	5,123	5,123			\$ 5,123
			ASSETS	Cash and interest-bearing deposits	Due from other governmental agencies	Total assets	LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES	Accounts payable	Accrued liabilities	Due to other funds	Total liabilities	Fund balances:	Assigned	Total liabilities and fund balances

CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA Nonmajor Special Revenue Funds

Combining Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balances Year Ended June 30, 2011

	Vernon Communication District	Mainstreet Program	OEA Grant	LCDBG Economic Development	Total
Revenues:					
Intergovernmental	· \$	\$ 22,926	\$ 32,031	FS3	\$ 54,957
Charges for services	456,024	,		•	456,024
Miscellaneous	367	325	•	40	732
Total revenues	456,391	23,251	32,031	40	511,713
Expenditures:					
General government	•	•	42,301	1	42,301
Public safety	535,073	•		•	535,073
Public works	•	35,351		•	35,351
Economic development		1		13	13
Total expenditures	535,073	35,351	42,301	13	612,738
Excess (deficiency) of revenues					
over expenditures	(78,682)	(12,100)	(10,270)	27	(101,025)
Other financing sources (uses):					
Transfers in	•	2,636	4,542	1	7,178
Transfers out	(3,841)	•	1	1	(3,841)
Total other financing sources (uses)	(3,841)	2,636	4,542	.	3,337
Excess (deficiency) of revenues and other sources over expenditures and other uses	(82,523)	(9,464)	(5,728)	27	(97,688)
Fund balances, beginning	82,523	9,464	5,728	7,340	105,055
Fund balances, ending	<i>γ</i> γ.	· &	S	\$ 7,367	S 7,367

NONMAJOR DEBT SERVICE FUNDS

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA Nonmajor Debt Service Funds

# Combining Balance Sheet June 30, 2011

	Sales Tax Sinking	2002 tes of Indebtedness	2004 GOB Street Improvements	Total
ASSETS				
Cash and interest-bearing deposits	\$253,361	\$2,103	\$ 25,788	\$281,252
Due from other funds		<u> </u>	160,6 <u>13</u>	160,613
Total assets	\$253,361	\$2,103	\$ 186,401	\$441,865
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES				
Liabilities	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Fund balances:	•			
Restricted for debt service	253,361	_2,103	186,401	441,865
Total liabilities and fund balances	\$253,361	\$2,103	\$ 186,401	\$4 <u>4</u> 1,865

## Nonmajor Debt Service Funds

# Combining Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balances Year Ended June 30, 2011

•		2002	2004 GOB	
	Sales Tax	Certificates of	Street	
	Sinking	Indebtedness	Improvements	Total
Revenues:				
Taxes	\$ -	<b>s</b> -	\$ 160,613	\$ 160,613
Miscellaneous	691	586	1,392	2,669
Total revenues	691	586	162,005	163,282
Expenditures:				•
Debt service	223,804	81,240	155,785	460,829
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over expenditures	(223,113)	(80,654)	6,220	(297,547)
Other financing sources (uses):				
Operating transfers in	38,079	1,485	-	39,564
Operating transfers out		(28,365)		(28,365)
Total other financing sources (uses)	38,079	(26,880)	<del></del> _	11,199
Excess (deficiency) of revenues and other sources over				
expenditures and other uses	(185,034)	(107,534)	6,220	(286,348)
Fund balances, beginning	438,395	109,637	180,181	728,213
Fund balances, ending	\$ 253,361	\$ 2,103	\$ 186,401	\$ 441,865

NONMAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS FUNDS

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA Nonmajor Capital Projects Funds

# Combining Balance Sheet June 30, 2011

	Airport Construction	LCDBG	2005 P.I. Tax Bonds	Total
ASSETS Cash and interest-bearing deposits	\$	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ 46</u>	\$ 46
LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES				
Liabilities	\$ -	\$ -	<b>\$</b> -	<b>\$</b> -
Fund balances: Assigned			46	46
Total liabilities and fund balances	<u>s -                                    </u>	<u>s - </u>	<u>\$ 46</u>	<u>\$ 46</u>

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA Nonmajor Capital Projects Funds

# Combining Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balances Year Ended June 30, 2011

	Airport Constructi	on LCDBG	2005 P.I. Sales Tax Bonds	Total
Revenues:				
Miscellaneous	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2	\$ 2
Expenditures:				
Public works	-	-	84	84
Economic development	<u>.</u> .	20		20
Total expenditures		20	84	104
Deficiency of revenues over expenditures		(20	) (82)	(102)
Other financing sources (uses):				
Transfers in	6,659	<u> </u>	128	6,789
Excess (deficiency) of revenues				
over expenditures and other uses	6,659	9 (18	) 46	6,687
Fund balances (deficit), beginning	(6,659	2)18		(6,641)
Fund balances, ending	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	\$ 46	<u>\$ 46</u>

COMPLIANCE, INTERNAL CONTROL

AND

OTHER GRANT INFORMATION

# KOLDER, CHAMPAGNE, SLAVEN & COMPANY, LLC

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

C. Burton Kolder, CPA\* Russell F. Champagne, CPA\* Victor R. Slaven, CPA\* P. Troy Courville, CPA\* Geratd A. Thibodeaux, Jr., CPA\* Robert S. Carter, CPA\* Arthur R. Mixon, CPA\*

Tyres E. Mixon, Jr., CPA
Allen J. LeBry, CPA
Allen J. LeBry, CPA
Albert R. Leger, CPA, PFS, CSA\*
Penny Angolle Scruggins, CPA
Christine L. Coulen, CPA
Mary T. Thibodeaux, CPA
Marshall W. Guidry, CPA
Alan M. Taytor, CPA
James R. Roy, CPA
Robert J. Metz, CPA
Kelly M. Doucett, CPA
Cheryl L. Bartley, CPA
Mandy B. Self, CPA
Paul L. Delcambre, Jr. CPA
Wanda F. Arcement, CPA, CVA
Kristin B. Dauzatt, CPA
Carolyn C. Andertson, CPA
Carolyn C. Andertson, CPA
Metthew E. Marspagio, CPA
Jane R, Hebert, CPA

Retired: Conrad O. Chapman, CPA\* 2006 Harry J. Clostio, CPA 2007

### **OFFICES**

183 South Beadle Rd. Lafayette, LA 70508 Phone (337) 232-4141 Fax (337) 232-8660 450 East Main Street New Iberia, LA 70560 Phone (337) 367-9204 Fax (337) 367-9208

113 East Bridge St. Breaux Bridge, LA 70517 Phone (337) 332-4020 Fax (337) 332-2867 200 South Main Street Abbeville, LA 70510 Phone (337) 893-7944 Fax (337) 893-7946

1234 David Or. Ste 203 Morgan City, LA 70380 Phone (985) 384-2020 Fax (985) 384-3020 1013 Main Street Franklin, LA 70538 Phone (337) 828-0272 Fax (337) 828-0290

408 West Cotton Street Ville Platte, LA 70586 Phone (337) 363-2792 Fex (337) 363-3049 133 East Waddil St. Marksville LA 71351 Phone (318) 253-9252 Fax (318) 253-8681

332 West Sixth Avenue Operlin, LA 70655 Phone (337) 639-4737 Fax (337) 639-4568

621 Main Street Pineville, LA 71360 Phone (318) 442-4421 Fax (318) 442-9833

WEB SITE WWW.KCSRCPAS.COM

REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER
FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE
AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT
OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN
ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS

The Honorable C. Robert Rose, Mayor and Members of the City Council City of Leesville, Louisiana

We have audited the financial statements of the governmental activities, the business-type activities each major fund and the aggregate remaining fund information of the City of Leesville, Louisiana's primary government as of and for the year ended June 30, 2011, and have issued our report thereon dated December 16, 2011. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

### Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the City of Leesville, Louisiana's internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the City of Leesville, Louisiana's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the City of Leesville, Louisiana's internal control over financial reporting.

A deficiency in internal control exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct misstatements on a timely basis. A material weakness is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be deficiencies, significant deficiencies, or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above. However, we identified certain deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting, described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs that we consider to be significant deficiencies in internal control over financial report as items 2011-1, 2011-2, 2011-3 and 2011-4. A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

<sup>\*</sup> A Professional Accounting Corporation

## Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the City of Leesville, Louisiana's financial statements are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statements amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards* and which are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as items 2011-5, 2011-6, 2011-7, 2011-8, 2011-9, and 2011-10.

We noted certain other matters that we have reported to management of the City of Leesville, Louisiana a separate letter dated December 16, 2011. The City's responses to the findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying summary schedule of current and prior year audit findings. We did not audit the City's responses and, accordingly, we express no opinion on it.

This report is intended solely for the information of the City's management and federal awarding agencies and pass-through entities and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties. Although the intended use of this report maybe limited, under Louisiana Revised Statute 24:513, this report is distributed by the Legislative Auditor as a public document.

Kolder, Champagne, Slaven & Company, LLC
Certified Public Accountants

Lafayette, Louisiana December 16, 2011

# KOLDER, CHAMPAGNE, SLAVEN & COMPANY, LLC

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

C. Burton Kolder, CPA\* Russell F. Champagne, CPA\* Victor R. Slaven, CPA\* V. Troy Counville, CPA\* Gerald A. Thibodeaux, Jr., CPA\* Robert S. Carter, CPA\* Aritrar R. Mixon, CPA\*

Tymes E. Mixon, Jr., CPA
Allon J. LaBry, CPA
Allon J. LaBry, CPA
Allon J. LaBry, CPA
Permy Angelio Scruggins, CPA
Christine L. Cousin, CPA
Mary T. Thibodeaux, CPA
Marshell W. Guldny, CPA
Alan M. Taylor, CPA
James R. Roy, CPA
Robert J. Metz, CPA
Kelly M. Doucet, CPA
Cheryl L. Barriley, CPA
Mandy B. Self, CPA
Paul L. Dolcambre, Jr. CPA
Vranda F. Arcernent, CPA, CVA
Kristin B. Dauzst, CPA
Richard R. Anderson Sr., CPA
Carolyn C. Anderson, CPA
Matthew E. Margagilo, CPA
Jane R, Hebert, CPA

Retired: Conrad O. Chapman, CPA\* 2006 Harry J. Clostio, CPA 2007

\* A Professional Accounting Corporation

OFFICES

183 South Beadle Rd. Lafayette, LA 70508 Phone (337) 232-4141 Fax (337) 232-8660 450 East Main Street New iberia, LA 70560 Phone (337) 367-9204 Fax (337) 367-9208

113 East Bridge St. Breaux Bridge, LA 70517 Phone (337) 332-4020 Fax (337) 332-2867 200 South Main Street Abbeville, LA 70510 Phone (337) 893-7944 Fax (337) 893-7948

1234 David Dr. Ste 203 Morgan City, LA 70380 Phone (985) 384-2020 Fax (985) 384-3020 1013 Main Street Franklin, LA 70538 Phone (337) 828-0272 Fax (337) 828-0290

408 West Cotton Street Ville Platte, LA 70586 Phone (337) 363-2792 Fax (337) 363-3049 133 East Weddi St. Marksville LA 71351 Phone (318) 253-9252 Fax (318) 253-8681

332 West Sixth Avenue Obertin, LA 70655 Phone (337) 639-4737 Fax (337) 639-4568 621 Main Street Pineville, LA 71360 Phone (316) 442-4421 Fax (318) 442-9833

WEB SITE WWW.KCSRCPAS.COM

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON COMPLIANCE
WITH REQUIREMENTS THAT COULD HAVE A DIRECT AND
MATERIAL EFFECT ON EACH MAJOR PROGRAM AND
ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE IN
ACCORDANCE WITH OMB CIRCULAR A-133

The Honorable C. Robert Rose, Mayor and Members of the City Council City of Leesville, Louisiana

## Compliance

We have audited the City of Leesville, Louisiana's compliance with the types of compliance requirements described in the OMB Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement that could have a direct and material effect on each of the City of Leesville, Louisiana's major federal program for the year ended June 30, 2011. The City of Leesville, Louisiana's major federal program is identified in the summary of auditors' results section of the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. Compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts and grants applicable to its major federal program is the responsibility of the City of Leesville, Louisiana's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the City of Leesville, Louisiana's compliance based on our audit.

We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and OMB Circular A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments and Non-Profit Organizations. Those standards and OMB Circular A-133 require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about the City of Leesville, Louisiana's compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion. Our audit does not provide a legal determination on the City of Leesville, Louisiana's compliance with those requirements.

In our opinion, the City of Leesville, Louisiana complied, in all material respects, with the compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on its major federal program for the year ended June 30, 2011. However, the results of our auditing procedures disclosed an instance of noncompliance with those requirements, which is required to be reported in accordance with OMB Circular A-133 and which is described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as item 2011-12.

## Internal Control Over Compliance

Management of the City of Leesville, Louisiana is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to federal programs. In planning and performing our audit, we considered the City of Leesville, Louisiana's internal control over compliance with the requirements that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program in order to determine our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on compliance and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with OMB Circular A-133, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the City of Leesville, Louisiana's internal control over compliance.

A deficiency in internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program on a timely basis. A material weaknesses in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis.

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be deficiencies, significant deficiencies, or material weaknesses. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses, as defined above.

The City of Leesville, Louisiana's responses to the finding identified in our audit is described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. We did not audit the City of Leesville, Louisiana's response and, accordingly, we express no opinion on it.

This report is intended for the information of the City of Leesville, Louisiana's management, and federal awarding agencies and pass-through entities and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Kolder, Champagne, Slaven & Company, LLC Certified Public Accountants

Lafayette, Louisiana December 16, 2011

# Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards Year Ended June 30, 2011

Federal Grantor / Pass-Through Grantor / Program Name	Federal CFDA Number	Disbursements/ Expenditures
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency		
Passed-through State of Louisiana Department of		
Environmental Quality:		
ARRA - Capitalization Grants for Clean Water *	66.458	\$ 753,120
U.S. Department of Homeland Security		
Assistance to Firefighters Grant	97.044	116,701
Passed-through State of Louisiana Office of Homeland		
Security and Emergency Preparedness:		
Homeland Security Grant Program	97.067	55,590
Total U.S. Department of Homeland Security		172,291
U.S. Department of Transportation		
Passed-through State of Louisiana Department of Public Safety		
and Corrections - Louisiana Highway Safety Commission		
ARRA - Highway Planning and Construction	20.205	8,640
State and Community Highway Safety	20.600	2,700
Alcohol Impaired Driving Countermeasures		
Incentive Grants	20.601	12,285
Total U.S. Department of Transportation		23,625
U.S. Department of Justice		
ARRA - Office of Community Oriented Policing Services	16.710	40,966
TOTAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES		\$ 990,002

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates Major Program

## Notes to Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards Year Ended June 30, 2011

## (1) General

The accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards presents the activity of all federal financial assistance programs of the City of Leesville, Louisiana (the "City"). The City's reporting entity is defined in Note 1 to the primary government financial statements for the year ended June 30, 2011. All federal financial assistance received directly from federal agencies is included on the schedule as well as federal financial assistance passed through other government agencies. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Passed through State of Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality — Capitalization Grants for Clean Water program was considered to be a major federal program.

## (2) Basis of Accounting

The accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards is presented using the modified accrual basis of accounting, which is described in Note 1 to the City's primary government financial statements for the year ended June 30, 2011.

## (3) Relationship to Primary Government Financial Statements

Federal financial assistance revenues/expenditures are reported in the City's primary government financial statements as follows:

From federal sources:

Government Fund Types -

Special Revenue Funds \$ 236,882

Proprietary Fund Type -

Total federal expenditures reported in the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards

\$ 990,002

### (4) Relationship to Federal Financial Reports

Amounts reported in the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards agree with the amounts reported in the related financial reports.

## Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs Year Ended June 30, 2011

### Part I. Summary of Auditor's Results:

- The auditor's report expresses an adverse opinion on the financial statements of the City of Leesville's reporting entity because they do not include financial data of all component units.
   An unqualified opinion was issued on the basic financial statements of the City of Leesville, Louisiana's primary government.
- 2. There were four significant deficiencies in internal control disclosed by the audit of the financial statements.
- 3. There were six instances of noncompliance disclosed by the audit of the financial statements.
- 4. There were no significant deficiencies in internal control over the major program disclosed by the audit of the financial statements.
- 5. An unqualified opinion was issued on compliance for the major program.
- 6. Audit findings that are required to be reported in accordance with Section 510(a) of Circular A-133 are reported in this schedule.
- 7. The major program was:
  - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Passed through State of Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality Capitalization Grants for Clean Water CFDA No. 66.458.
- 8. The dollar threshold used to distinguish between Type A and Type B programs, as described in Section 520(b) of Circular A-133 was \$300,000.
- 9. The auditee did not qualify as a low-risk auditee under Section 530 of Circular A-133.

# Part II. Findings that are required to be reported in accordance with generally accepted Governmental Auditing Standards:

See Findings 2011-1 through 2011-10 the Summary Schedule of Current and Prior Year Audit Findings and Corrective Action Plan.

# Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Continued) Year Ended June 30, 2011

# Part III. Findings and questioned costs for Federal awards which include audit findings as defined in Section 510(a) of Circular A-133:

### U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY:

Compliance Finding -

### 2011-10 Untimely Disbursement of Funds to Contractor

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Passed through State of Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality – Capitalization Grants for Clean Water CFDA No. 66.458

### Criteria

The Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) was allocated over \$43 million dollars through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), to provide funding for wastewater infrastructure needs through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program (CWSRF). One of the projects funded was submitted by the City of Leesville, Louisiana (the City), for a lift station upgrade and rehabilitation of approximately 3,000 feet of existing collection lines. The CWSRF loan documents required the City to pay promptly all approved costs of the project.

### Condition

In December 2010, the City received reimbursement for approved costs of the Project. The City's contractor also submitted its request for payment to the City in December 2010 for \$179,574; however, the City did not pay the contractor until April 15, 2011.

## Context

The City of Leesville did not follow the provisions of the CWSRF loan documents requiring the City to pay promptly all approved costs of the project.

## Effect

The City of Leesville did not follow the provisions of the CWSRF loan documents requiring the City to pay promptly all approved costs of the project.

# Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs (Continued) Year Ended June 30, 2011

## Recommendation

The City should take the necessary action to ensure that the requirements of the CWSRF loan documents are followed.

## Planned Corrective Action and Management's Response

On March 29, 2011, it was brought to the LDEQ's attention that the City's contractor had not been paid the balance due for work performed in December 2010. The LDEQ immediately contacted the City and requested an explanation as to the four-month delay in making payment to the contractor. The City responded promptly to the LDEQ's inquiry and paid the contractor all amounts due

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA

Anticipated Date of Completion		N/A	6/30/2012	6/30/2012
Name of Contact Person		Hugh King, City Administrator	Hugh King, City Administrator	Tobi Droegemeier, Finance Director
Na Conta		Hugh City Admin	Hugh City Admin	Tobi Droegen Finance Director
Corrective Action Plan		The City has evaluated the cost vs. benefit of establishing internal controls over the preparation of financial statements in accordance with GAAP, and determined that it is in the best interests of the government to outsource this task to its independent auditors, and to carefully review the draft financial statements and notes prior to approving them and accepting responsibility for their contents and presentation.	The City is in the process of drafting internal control policies that will resolve this matter. The City will establish policies and procedures to centralize grant record-keeping.	The City will adopt and implement written policies and procedures covering the use of credit cards and fuel cards. The credit and fuel card usage policy will address how credit and fuel cards are to be controlled, define allowable business use and charges, define a method for monitoring usage and required approvals and proper documentation.
Corrective Action Taken				·
Description of Finding	.0/11)	The City does not have a staff person who has the qualifications and training to apply generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) in recording the entity's financial transactions or preparing its financial statements, including the related notes.	The City does not have adequate controls over grant accounting. Policies and procedures should be established in order to centralize grant record-keeping.	The City does not have formal written policies and procedures covering the use of credit cards and fuel cards. The City should prepare and adopt a comprehensive credit and fuel card usage policy. This policy should address how credit and fuel cards are to be controlled, define allowable business use and charges, define a method for monitoring usage and required approvals and proper documentation.
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Occurred	CURRENT YEAR (06/30/11) Internal Control;	Unknown	2010	Unknown
Ref. No.	CURRENT YEA	2011-1	2011-2	2011-3

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA

Anticipated Date of Completion	6/30/2012	6/30/2012
Name of Contact Person	Hugh King, City Administrator	Tobi Droegemeier, Finance Director
Corrective Action Plan	The City will adopt and implement policies and procedures whereas someone is specifically identified with oversight responsibility of all contracts and that a list of all contracts is maintained summarizing significant provisions of such contracts.	The City will define assets that will be inventoried, including the minimum value for inclusion on the list of capital assets, prepare a detailed listing of capital assets, take a physical inventory to identify assets that belong to the City and include a tag number on the listing of capital assets.
Corrective Action Taken		
Description of Finding	The City does not have formal written policies and procedures covering contracts/contracting. The City also does not have centralized control and oversight of contracts to ensure services and deliverables received and payments made comply with the terms and condition of the contracts. The City should prepare and adopt policies and procedures covering contracts and contracting activities. This policy should address what types of services require written contracts, define the standard terms and conditions of contracts, and address the legal review, approval and monitoring processes over contracts.	The City of Leesville does not have adequate inventory records for capital assets and has not conducted physical inventories as required by LSA-RS 24:515. The city should establish and implement a policy for capital assets which includes a dollar threshold for items to be included in inventory and requires periodic physical inventories.
Fiscal Year Finding Initially RCf. No. Occurred CURRENT YEAR (06/30/11) Internal Control:	2011	Unknown
Fisc Fig Rcf. No. Oc CURRENT YEA	2011-4	Compliance: 2011-5

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA

Anticipated Date of	Completion	1/31/2012	1/31/2012	1/31/2012
Name of	Contact Person	Tobi Droegemeier, Finance Director	Tobi Droegemeier, Finance Director	Tobi Droegemeier, Finance Director
	Corrective Action Plan	As of the audit report date, the City is complying with the sinking fund deposit requirements.	The City will open a checking account for the Sales Tax Reserve Fund.	In the future, the City will prepare an amended budget when necessary.
Corrective Action	Taken			
	Description of Finding	The City did not comply with the sinking fund deposit requirements for its various bond issues. The bond issues require that amounts be transferred monthly into the sinking fund accounts. The required transfers were not made to these account for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. It is recommended that the City fully comply with the sinking fund deposit transfers as required by the bond issues.	The City has not established separate bank accounts for the Sales Tax Bond Sinking Fund and the Sales Tax Bond Reserve Fund required by the Sales Tax Revenue Public Improvement Bonds, Series 2005. Currenlty, one bank account is being utilized for both of the bond funds.	The City did not amend the Public Safety Special Revenue Fund budget in accordance with LSA-RS 39:1311(A)(1) & (2) that states when total actual revenues and other sources or expenditures and other uses plus projected revenues and other sources or expenditures and other uses for the remainder of the year are failing to meet or exceeding the total budgeted expenditures by flive percent or more, the budget must be amended. Total revenues were less than budgeted revenues by 5.2% or \$103,475. Total expenditures exceeded budgeted expenditures by 8% or \$280,069.
Fiscal Year Finding Initially	Ref. No. Occured CURRENT YEAR (06/30/11)	2010	2010	2010
	CCRRENT	2011-6	2011-7	2011-8

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA

Anticipated Date of Completion		12/31/2011	4/15/2011
Name of Contact Person		Tobi Droegemeier, Finance Director	Hugh King, City Administrator
Conta		Tobi Droegen Finance Director	Hugh City Admii
Corrective Action Plan		All budgets adopted in the future will be balanced whereas anticipated expenditures do not exceed anticipated revenues and fund balances carryforward from the previous year.	On March 29, 2011, it was brought to the LDEQ's attention that the City's contractor had not been paid the balance due for work performed in December 2010.  The LDEQ immediately contacted the City and requested an explanation as to the four-month delay in making payment to the contractor. The City responded promptly to the LDEQ's inquiry and paid the contractor all amounts due.
Corrective Action Taken			Yes
Description of Finding	.0/11) —	The City did not properly adopt the Public Safety Special Revenue Fund budget in accordance with LSA-RS 39:1309(B) that states the adopted budget shall be balanced with approved expenditures not exceeding the total of estimated funds available. The City adopted a budget for the Public Safety Speical Revenue Fund with an ending deficit of \$586,807 and an amended deficit of \$692,264.	The City of Leesville participated in the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program (CWSRF) for a lift station upgrade and rehabilitation of approximately 3,000 feet of existing collection lines. The CWSRF loan documents required the City to pay promptly all approved costs of the project. In December 2010, the City received reimbursement for approved costs of the Project. The City's contractor also submitted its request for payment to the City in December 2010 for \$179,574, however, the City did not pay the contractor until April 15, 2011. The City of Leesville did not follow the provisions of the CWSRF loan documents requiring the City to pay promptly all approved costs of the project.
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Occurred	CURRENT YEAR (06/30/11) Compliance:	2011	2011
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Ref. No. Occurred	CURRENT Compliance:	2011-9	2011-10

# Summary Schedule of Current and Prior Year Audit Findings and Corrective Action Plan (Continued) Year Ended June 30, 2011

Anticipated Date of Completion	6/30/2012	12/31/2011	3/31/2011
Name of Contact Person	Hugh King, City Administrator	Tobi Droegemeier, Finance Director	Tobi Droegemeier, Finance Director
Corrective Action Plan	It was an oversight that an insignificant amount of sick leave was included in the computation of the final payroll paid to an employee that resigned without having proper documentation authorizing such in the cmployees personnel file. All future termination payments will be closely reviewed for proper documentation.	The City will complete a thorough evaluation of all employee personnel files to ensure that all compliant data is available.	Since March 2011 the City was no longer collecting and remitting sales taxes on sewer sales and is working to recover sales tax monies in order to issue refunds.
Corrective Action Taken		Yes	Y.
Description of Finding	The City did not comply with personnel policies and procedures governing vacation and sick leave. During the year ended June 30, 2011, one employee was paid accumulated sick leave. This employee was not eligible for such a payment under the City's policy, and there was no wirtten approval from the Ctiy Administrator maintained within the personnel files.	Policies and procedures should be implemented to ensure that adequate documentation of Louisiana Employee Withholding Exemption Certificate, Form L-4, and employee authorized deductions, if any, and that authorized pay rates are placed in personnel files.	For the year ended June 30, 2010, the City's utility system collected sales taxes on sewer sales. Sewer sales are exempt from Louisiana sales tax. Although this practice has been discontinued, the City should make arrangements to recover sales tax monies remitted to the state since July 1, 2009. The City should also credit customer accounts for sales taxes incorrectly charged.
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Ref. No. Occurred CURRENT YEAR (06/30/11)	2010	2010	2010
Ref. No.	<u>Management Letter:</u> 2011-11 2010	2011-12	2011-13

(continued)

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA

Fiscal Year Finding Initially Ref. No. Occurred CURRENT YEAR (06/30/11)	Description of Finding	Corrective Action Taken	Corrective Action Plan	Name of Contact Person	Anticipated Date of Completion
The City's system absences is not centual leave has to be a City should develoensure that all empland accounted for.	The City's system of tracking the compensated absences is not centralized. It was also noted that not all leave has to be approved before being taken. The City should develop and implement procedures to ensure that all employee leave is properly authorized and accounted for.	Yes	The City has developed and implemented procedures to ascertain that the recording of all absences is centralized and ensure that all employee leave is properly authorized and accounted for. The new accounting software is being used to accomplish much of this.	Tobi Droegemeler, Finance Director	12/31/2011
For fiscal year ending June 30, 2006 questioned costs relating to overtime costs for the Police Department a hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Ti overstatement of costs associated v Katrina of \$51,763 which was requeste Therefore, the City owed the feder \$51,763 for overstated costs. For the y 30, 2007, the City recorded a liability but did not properly remit the funds.	For fiscal year ending June 30, 2006, the City had questioned costs relating to overtime and equipment costs for the Police Department associated with hurricanes Katrina and Rita. There was an overstatement of costs associated with Hurricane Katrina of \$51,763 which was requested and received. Therefore, the City owed the federal government \$51,763 for overstated costs. For the year ended June 30, 2007, the City recorded a liability for the \$51,763 but did not properly remit the funds. As of June 30, 2011, these funds remain unpaid.		The City will first submit a formal request that this obligation be forgiven or, as an alternative, attempt to negate the impact of the liability by requesting a payment plan.	Hugh King. City Administrator	6/30/2012
Management should implement procedures to ensure that proper do maintained for all travel expenses. This should include the public purpose of proper written approval.	Management should implement policies and procedures to ensure that proper documentation is maintained for all travel expenses. This documentation should include the public purpose of the travel and proper written approval.		Management will not approve any travel expenses for payment without the supporting documentation being submitted and approved.	Hugh King, City Administrator	6/30/2012

# Summary Schedule of Current and Prior Year Audit Findings and Corrective Action Plan (Continued) Year Ended June 30, 2011

Anticipated Date of Completion		1/31/2012	6/30/2012	12/31/2011
Name of Contact Person		Hugh King, City Administrator	Tobí Droegemeier, Finance Director	City Administrator
Corrective Action Plan		The City will adopt and implement policies and procedures for the processing of payroll transactions which will address the approval process for timesheets, vacation and sick time used, and the use of time clocks by hourly employees.	The City will evaluate it's software to determine if restrictions exist on adding or deleting vendors. The accounts payable/purchasing procedures will be changed accordingly. The City will implement procedures to monitor compliance with the public bid law requirements. The City will also adopt policies and procedures for receiving, recording, and preparing deposits.	Procedures are currently in place to make certain that all payroll taxes/withholdings are being remitted timely.
Соттестіvе Action Taken				Yes
Description of Finding	- (0/11)	The City does not have formal written policies and procedures in place covering the processing of payroll transactions. The City should prepare and adopt policies and procedures detailing the processing of payroll transactions. This policy should address the approval process for timesheets and vacation and sick time used. This policy should also address the proper use of time clocks by hourly employees.	The City's accounts payable/purchasing procedures do not discuss how vendors are added to the vendor list and there are no checks and balances to ensure compliance with the public bid law. In addition, the City does not have written policies and procedures for handling receipts. We recommend that someone separate from the purchasing function have authorization to add and/or delete vendors. In addition procedures need to be implemented to monitor compliance with the public bid law requirements. Policies and procedures for receiving, recording, and preparing deposits need to be adopted.	Payroll taxes and/or employee withholdings were not being remitted timely.
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Occurred	CURRENT YEAR (06/30/11) Management Letter	2011	2011	2011
Ref. No.	CURRENT YEAR (	2011-17	2011-18	2011-19

(continued)

Ref. No.	Fiscal Year Finding Initially Occurred	Description of Finding	Corrective Action Taken	Corrective Action Plan	Name of Contact Person	Anticipated Date of Completion
PRIOR YI	PRIOR YEAR (06/30/10)					
Internal Control:	ontrol:					
2010-1	Unknown	The City does not have a staff person who has the qualifications and training to apply generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) in recording the entity's financial transactions or preparing its financial statements, including the related notes.	8	See current year finding 2011-1		
2010-2	2010	The City does not have adequate segregation of duties over cash receipts at the City's swimming pool. Procedures should be implemented to ensure adequate segregation of duties between the record keeping and cash custody functions.	Yes			
2010-3	2010	The City does not have adequate controls over grant accounting. Policies and procedures should be established in order to centralize grant record-keeping.	ž	See current year finding 2011-2		
2010-4	Unknown	The City does not have procedures in place to compile an accounts payable listing.	Yes			

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA

Summary Schedule of Current and Prior Year Audit Findings and Corrective Action Plan (Continued)

Year Ended June 30, 2011

Anticipated Date of Completion					
Name of Contact Person					
Corrective Action Plan					See current year finding 2011-5
Corrective Action Taken		Yes	Yes		Š
Description of Finding		The City lacks proper internal controls to ensure that inventory is properly accounted for. Procedures should be implemented to ensure that each department is properly charged for all inventory used.	The accounting software has not been adapted to limit access to different modules to only those employees requiring access. There is currently no information system policy in place to address back-ups or a recovery plan in the event of a disaster. There is no log detailing changes to critical data and changes are not approved by the City administration.		The City of Lecsville does not have adequate inventory records for capital assets and has not conducted physical inventories as required by LSA-RS 24:515. The city should establish and implement a policy for capital assets which includes a dollar threshold for items to be included in inventory and requires periodic physical inventories.
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Occurred	PRIOR YEAR (06/30/10) Internal Control:	Unknown	Unknown	• N	Unknown
Ref. No.	PRIOR YEAR ((	2010-5	2010-6	Compliance:	2010-7

i

Anticipated Date of Completion			
Name of Contact Person			
Corrective Action Plan	See current year finding 2011-6	See current year finding 2011-7	
Corrective Action Taken	Ž	Š	Yes
Description of Finding	The City did not comply with the sinking fund deposit requirements for its various bond issues. The bond issues require that amounts be transferred monthly into the sinking fund accounts. The required transfers were not made in full to these accounts for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2010. It is recommended that the City fully comply with the sinking fund deposit transfers as required by the bond issues.	The City has not established separate bank accounts for the Sales Tax Bond Sinking Fund and the Sales Tax Bond Reserve Fund required by the Sales Tax Revenue Public Improvement Bonds, Series 2005. Currently, one bank account is being utilized for both of the bond funds.	State law requires audit reports to be completed and submitted six months after the fiscal year. The City's audit report was not complete until after the deadline imposed by State law.
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Ref. No. Occurred PRIOR YEAR (06/30/10) Compliance:	2010	2010	2010
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Ref. No. Occurred PRIOR YEAR (06/30//	2010-8	2010-9	2010-10

Anticipated Date of Completion		
Name of Contact Person		
Corrective Action Plan		See current year finding 2011-8
Corrective Action Taken	Yes	Ž
Description of Finding	The City did not amend the General Fund budget in accordance with LSA-RS 39:1311(A)(2) that states when total actual expenditures and other uses plus projected expenditures and other uses for the remainder of the year are exceeding the total budgeted expenditures by five percent or more, the budget must be amended. Total expenditures exceeded budgeted expenditures by 34% or \$604,258.	The City did not amend the Public Safety Special Revenue Fund budget in accordance with LSA-RS 39:1311(A)(2) that states when total actual expenditures and other uses plus projected expenditures and other uses for the remainder of the year are exceeding the total budgeted expenditures by five percent or more, the budget must be amended. Total expenditures exceeded budgeted expenditures by 38% or \$1,140,564.
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Ref. No. Occurred PRIOR YEAR (06/30/10)	2010	2010
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Ref. No. Occurred PRIOR YEAR (06/30/1	Compliance: 2010-11	2010-12

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA

Anticipated Date of Completion				
Name of Contact Person				
Corrective Action Plan				See current year finding 2011-11
Corrective Action Taken		Yes		°Z
Description of Finding	<b>-</b> ((	The City did not amend the Vernon Communication District Special Revenue Fund budget in accordance with LSA-RS 39:1311(A)(2) that states when total actual expenditures and other uses plus projected expenditures and other uses for the remainder of the year are exceeding the total budgeted expenditures by five percent or more, the budget must be amended. Total expenditures exceeded budgeted expenditures by 31% or \$161,459.		The City did not comply with personnel policies and procedures governing vacation and sick leave. During the year ended June 30, 2010, three retiring employees were paid accumulated vacation and sick leave of \$73,934 in excess of the maximum allowed under the policy.
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Ref. No. Occurred	PRIOR YEAR (06/30/10) Compliance:	2010	t Letter:	2010
Ref. No.	PRIOR YEA	2010-13	Management Letter:	2010-14

Anticipated Date of	Completion			·	
Name of	Contact Person				
and the second of the second o	Corecuve Action Figure			See current year finding 2011-12	
Corrective Action	I aveil		Yes	Ž	Yes
Description of Finding			The City's governmental funds experienced a deficiency during the current year of \$1,096,585. Also the City's proprietary funds experienced a deficiency during the current year of \$306,404. The City should evaluate operations to determine methods to increase revenues and/or reduce expenditures in order to operate at a surplus.	Policies and procedures should be implemented to ensure that adequate documentation of Louisiana Employee Withholding Exemption Certificate, Form L-4, and employee authorized deductions, if any, and that authorized pay rates are placed in personnel files.	While reviewing the City's bank reconciliations, it was noted that the City is carrying outstanding checks that are greater than one year old on some of its accounts. Management should examine each outstanding item and void outstanding checks as needed in order to properly reflect a more accurate cash balance. We recommend that management establish a formal, written policy concerning outstanding checks based on current escheat laws.
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Occurred	PRIOR YEAR (06/30/10)	t Letter:	2010	2010	Unknown
Ref No.	PRIOR YEA	Management Letter:	2010-15	2010-16	2010-17

# CITY OF LEESVILLE, LOUISIANA

tive Anticipated and Anticipated and Date of Date of	Corrective Action Plan Contact Person C			See current year finding 2011-13			
or Corrective Action	Description of Finding			For the year ended June 30, 2010, the City's utility system collected sales taxes on sewer sales. Sewer sales are exempt from Louisiana sales tax. The City should discontinue this practice immediately and make arrangements to recover sales tax monies remitted to the state since July 1, 2009. The City should also credit customer accounts for sales taxes incorrectly charged.	Utility customers who are delinquent and have been Yes discontinued and subsequently written off should be given inactive status in the utility billing system. Inactive customers should never be deleted from the system.	Franchise tax revenue for the year ended June 30, 2010 Yes decreased significantly. Management should consider verifying the amounts used by the utility companies in computing the remittances made to the City.	The City should establish procedures that prohibit Yes
Fiscal Year Finding Initially	Occurred	R (06/30/10	Letter:	2010	2010	2010	2010
	Ref. No.	PRIOR YEAR (06/30/10)	Management Letter:	2010-18	2010-19	2010-20	2010-21

Anticipated Date of Completion					
Name of Contact Person					
Corrective Action Plan				See current year finding 2011-14	See current year finding 2011-15
Corrective Action Taken			Yes	92	o Z
Description of Finding			During the year ended June 30, 2010, several employees were charged the incorrect amount as a payroll deduction for group health insurance. Efforts should be made to verify all group insurance payroll deductions for accuracy and to properly correct all discrepancies.	The City's system of tracking the compensated absences is not centralized. It was also noted that not all leave has to be approved before being taken. The City should develop and implement procedures to ensure that all employee leave is properly authorized and accounted for.	For fiscal year ending June 30, 2006, the City had questioned costs relating to overtime and equipment costs for the Police Department associated with hurricanes Katrina and Rita. There was an overstatement of costs associated with Hurricane Katrina of \$51,763 which was requested and received. Therefore, the City owed the federal government \$51,763 for overstated costs. For the year ended June 30, 2007, the City recorded a liability for the \$51,763 but did not properly remit the funds. As of June 30, 2010, these funds remain unpaid.
Fiscal Year Finding Initially Ref. No. Occurred	PRIOR YEAR (06/30/10)	it Letter:	2010	Unknown	2006
Ref. No.	PRIOR YE,	Management Letter:	2010-22	2010-23	2010-24

	Anticipated	Date of	Completion			
		Name of	Contact Person			·
			Corrective Action Plan			
	Corrective	Action	Taken			×
			Description of Finding			During the year ended June 30, 2010, there were several ineligible participants included in the group health plan. The City should review the participant listing for the group health plan for eligibility to ensure that all individuals receiving coverage are eligible to do
Fiscal Year	Finding	Initially	Осситед	PRIOR YEAR (06/30/10)	Letter:	2010 Dus sev hea hea listi
			Ref. No.	PRIOR YEA	Management Letter:	2010-25

# INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

# KOLDER, CHAMPAGNE, SLAVEN & COMPANY, LLC

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

C. Burton Kolder, CPA\* Russell F. Champagne, CPA\* Victor R. Sieven, CPA\* P. Troy Courville, CPA\* Gerald A. Thöodeaux, Jr., CPA\* Robert S. Certer, CPA\* Arthur R. Mixon, CPA\*

Tynes E. Mixon, Jr., CPA
Allen J. LaBry, CPA
Allen J. LaBry, CPA
Permy Angelle Scruggins, CPA
Christino L. Gousin, CPA
Marshall W. Guidry, CPA
Marshall W. Guidry, CPA
James R. Roy, CPA
Robert J. Metz, CPA
Kally M. Dounest , CPA
Cheryl L. Bartloy, CPA
Mardy B. Seif, CPA
Paul L. Delambre, Jr. CPA
Wanda F. Arcement, CPA, CVA
Kristin B. Dauzat, CPA
Carolyn C. Anderson Sr., CPA
Carolyn C. Anderson Sr., CPA
James R. Anderson Sr., CPA
Mardy C. Anderson CPA
Matthew E. Margaglio, CPA
Jane R, Hebert, CPA

Retired\* Conrad O. Chapman, CPA\* 2006 Harry J. Clostio, CPA 2007

\* A Professional Accounting Corporation

OFFICES

183 South Beadle Rd. Lafayette, LA 70508 Phone (337) 232-4141 Fax (337) 232-8660 450 East Main Street New Iberia, LA 70580 Phone (337) 367-9204 Fax (337) 367-9208

113 East Bridge St. Breaux Bridge, LA 70517 Phone (337) 332-4020 Fax (337) 332-2867 200 South Main Street Abbeville, LA 70510 Phone (337) 893-7944 Fax (337) 893-7946

1234 David Dr. Ste 203 Morgan City, LA 70380 Phone (985) 384-2020 Fax (985) 384-3020 1013 Main Street Franklin, LA 70538 Phone (337) 828-0272 Fax (337) 828-0290

408 West Cotton Street Vitle Plette, LA 70586 Phone (337) 363-2792 Fax (337) 363-3049 133 East Waddil St. Marksville LA 71351 Phone (318) 253-9252 Fax (318) 263-8681

332 West Sorth Avenue Oberlin, LA 70655 Phone (337) 639-4737 Fax (337) 639-4568 621 Main Street Pineville, LA 71360 Phone (316) 442-4421 Fax (318) 442-9833

WEB SITE WWW.KCSRCPAS.COM

Mr. C. Robert Rose, Mayor and Members of the City Council Leesville, Louisiana

We have performed the procedures included in the Louisiana Government Audit Guide and enumerated below, which were agreed to by the management of the City of Leesville, Louisiana and the Legislative Auditor, State of Louisiana, solely to assist the users in evaluating management's assertions about the City of Leesville, Louisiana's compliance with certain laws and regulations during the period ended June 30, 2011 included in the accompanying Louisiana Attestation Questionnaire. Management of the City of Leesville, Louisiana is responsible for its financial records and compliance with applicable laws and regulations. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was performed in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and applicable standards of Government Auditing Standards. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the specific users of this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the purpose.

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT

ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

## I. Financial Management

1. Determine if management (chief executive and board members) was presented with timely and accurate monthly financial statements, including budget-to-actual comparisons on funds (General Fund, Special Revenue Fund, Utility Fund, etc.) of the entity, during the year under examination.

The board was not provided monthly financial statements with budget to actual comparisons until April 2011. Prior to April, the board was only presented with a schedule of bills to be paid along with the supporting documentation for each invoice.

A new administration took office on July 1, 2010. Not only did the City have a new Mayor, but the majority of the staff was also new employees. The Accounting Manager, who had been with the City for approximately 20 years, retired effective June 30, 2010. A new Accounting Manager was hired September 2010. This individual was not provided adequate training and had no previous governmental accounting experience. This employee resigned in February 2011 and was not replaced until late March 2011. The City also experienced similar turnover in the City Administrator position.

The lack of stability in staffing and the lack of proper training attributed to the City's inability to present timely and accurate financial statements. Financial statements are presently being presented.

2. If management was deficit spending during the period under examination, determine if there is a formal/written plan to eliminate the deficit spending and whether management is monitoring the plan.

Based upon discussions with the City Administrator, the City has no formal/written plan to eliminate deficit spending as of June 30, 2011. The current administration has taken many measures to reduce spending since taking office in July 1, 2010. They feel currently that they have eliminated deficit spending. Administration is continuing to look at all facets of operations for areas of improvement and/or reduce spending or take cost saving measurements. As of the date of this report, the audit report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011 does show that total governmental revenues of all funds exceeded total expenditures.

- 3. Determine if there are written policies and procedures for the following financial/business functions of the entity:
  - a. Budgeting, including preparing, adopting, monitoring, and amending the budget

The City has written policies and procedures covering budgeting.

b. Purchasing, including (1) how purchases are initiated; (2) how vendors are added to the vendor list; (3) the preparation and approval process of purchase requisitions and purchase orders; (4) checks and balances to ensure compliance with the public bid law; and (5) documentation required to be maintained for all bids and price quotes.

The City has formal written accounts payable policies and procedures. The written policies and procedures do not cover how vendors are added to the vendor list and there are no checks and balances to ensure compliance with the public bid law.

c. Disbursements, including processing, reviewing, and approving

The City has written policies and procedures covering the disbursement function.

d. Receipts, including receiving, recording, and preparing deposits

Based upon inquires of the Finance Director, the City currently has no written policies and procedures for handling receipts as of June 30, 2011.

#### II. Credit Cards

Obtain from management a listing of all active credit cards (and bank debit cards if applicable) for the
period under examination, including the card numbers and the names of the persons who maintained
possession of the cards.

We obtained a listing of all active credit cards for the period under examination. The document was prepared by the Accounts Payable Clerk. The City utilizes three types of credit cards, general credit such as VISA or MasterCard, store credit such as Wal-Mart, Office Depot, or Sam's Club, and fuel such as Fuelman and Exxon.

- 2. Obtain and review the entity's written policies and procedures for credit cards (and debit cards if applicable) and determine if the following is addressed:
  - How cards are to be controlled
  - Allowable business uses
  - Documentation requirements
  - Required approvers
  - Monitoring card usage

The City currently does not have any detailed written policies and procedures for credit cards or fuel track cards. The accounts payable policies and procedures briefly mention credit card documentation requirements.

3. Obtain the monthly statements for all credit cards (general, stores, and gasoline) used during the period under examination and select for detailed review, the two largest (dollar amount) statements for each card. (Note: For a debit card, select the two monthly bank statements with the largest dollar amount of debit charges):

The monthly statements for all credit cards used during the period under examination were obtained. The two largest (dollar amount) statements for each card were selected for detailed testing. The City currently uses five credit cards and 120 credit card transactions were tested.

- A. Obtain the entity's supporting documentation for the purchases/charges shown on the selected monthly statements:
  - Determine if each purchase is supported by:
    - o An original itemized receipt (i.e., identifies precisely what was purchased)
      - Of the 120 transactions tested, five purchases were not supported by an original itemized receipt. The City does not require departments to turn in receipts for fuel purchases using the fuel track cards.
    - O Documentation of the business/public purpose (Note: For meal charges, there should also be documentation of the individuals participating)
      - Of the 120 credit card transactions tested, five purchases were not supported by documentation of the business/public purpose.
    - Other documentation as may be required by policy (e.g., purchase order, authorization, etc.)

- Determine if each purchase is:
  - o In accordance with thresholds or guidelines established in the policies and procedures

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

c For an appropriate and necessary business purpose relative to the entity

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

 Determine if any purchases were made for personal purposes. If there are purchases made for personal purposes, determine the date(s) of reimbursement.

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

• Determine if any purchases effectively circumvented the entity's normal procurement/purchasing process and/or the Louisiana Public Bid Law (i.e., large or recurring purchases requiring the solicitation of bids or quotes).

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

B. Determine if there was any duplication of expenses by comparing all travel and related purchases to the appropriate person's expense reimbursement report(s).

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

C. Determine if each monthly credit card statement (including supporting documentation) was reviewed and approved, in writing, by someone other than the person making the purchases. [Note: Requiring such approval may constrain the legal authority of certain public officials (e.g., mayor of a Lawrason Act municipality.)

Of the 120 credit card transactions tested, five purchases were not supported by written approval from a department head or the City Administrator.

D. Determine if finance charges and/or late fees were assessed on the monthly statements.

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

### III. Travel and Expense Reimbursement

- 1. Obtain and review the entity's written policies and procedures for travel and expense reimbursement and determine if the following is addressed:
  - a. Allowable expenses
  - b. Dollar thresholds by category of expense
  - c. Documentation requirements
  - d. Required approvers

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

- 2. Obtain a listing of all travel and related expense reimbursements during the period under examination and select for review, the one person who was reimbursed the most money:
  - A. Obtain all of the expense reimbursement reports of the selected person, including the supporting documentation, and select the three largest (dollar) expense reports to review in detail (Note: If there are only three or less expense reports, review all (100%) of them.):
    - Determine if each expenditure is:
      - o Reimbursed in accordance with written policy (e.g., rates established for meals, mileage, lodging, etc

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

- o In accordance with thresholds or guidelines established in the policies and procedures
  - There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.
- o For an appropriate and necessary business purpose relative to the travel
  - Of the eleven travel expenses tested, five did not have documentation detailing the business/public purpose of the trip.
- Determine if each expenditure is supported by:
  - An original itemized receipt (i.e., identifies precisely what was purchased)
     [Note: An expense that is reimbursed based on an established per diem amount (e.g., meals) generally does not require a receipt.]

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

- o Documentation of the business/public purpose (Note: For meal charges, there should also be documentation of the individuals participating)
  - Of the eleven travel expenses tested, five did not have documentation detailing the business/public purpose of the trip.
- Other documentation as may be required by policy (e.g., authorization for travel, conference brochure, certificate of attendance, etc.)

• Determine if any of the expenditures were for personal purposes (e.g., extended hotel stays before or after training class, meals for spouses, entertainment, etc.).

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

 Determine if each expense report (including documentation) was reviewed and approved, in writing, by someone other than the person receiving reimbursement.

Of the eleven travel expenses tested, four were not properly approved in writing by the City Administrator.

B. Determine if there was any duplication of expenses by comparing the expense reports to charges/purchases made on credit card(s).

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

#### IV. Contracts

- 1. Obtain and review the entity's written policies and procedures for contracts/contracting, including leasing, and determine if the following is addressed:
  - Types of services requiring written contracts
  - Standard terms and conditions
  - Legal review
  - Approval process
  - Monitoring process

The City currently does not have written policies and procedures for contracts/contracting, including leasing.

2. Determine if the entity has centralized control and oversight of contracts to ensure that services/deliverables received and payments made comply with the terms and conditions of the contracts.

The City does not have centralized control and oversight of contracts to ensure that services/deliverables received and payments made comply with the terms and conditions of the contracts. The City's contracts are located in multiple locations within the administrative offices and no one person knows how to locate them.

3. Obtain and review the accounting records (e.g., general ledgers, accounts payable vendor history reports, invoices, etc.) for the period under examination to identify individuals/businesses being paid for contracted services (e.g., professional, technical, etc.). Select the five "vendors" that were paid the most money during the period and for each:

• Determine if there is a formal/written contract that supports the services arrangement and the total amount paid.

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

• Determine the business legitimacy of the vendor if not known by the auditor (e.g., look-up the vendor on the LA Secretary of State's website).

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

- 4. Obtain a listing of all active contracts and the expenditures made during the period under examination. Select for detailed review, the largest (dollar amount) contract in each of the following categories that was entered into during the period.
  - (1) Services
  - (2) Materials and supplies
  - (3) Public works

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

- A. Obtain the selected contracts and the related paid invoices and:
  - Determine if the contract is a related party transaction.

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

- Determine if the transaction is subject to the Louisiana Public Bid Law;
  - o If yes, determine if the entity complied with all requirements (e.g., solicited quotes or bids, advertisement, selected lowest bidder, etc.)

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

o If no, determine if the entity provided an open and competitive atmosphere (a good business practice) for the transaction/work.

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

Determine if the contract was awarded under the request for proposals (RFP) method. If
done so, obtain all proposals and the evaluation/scoring documents to determine if the
contract was awarded to the most responsible offeror whose proposal was the most
advantageous taking into consideration price and other evaluation factors set forth in the
request for proposals.

This attribute was not applicable to the contract tested.

Determine if the procurement was made "off" state contract (as opposed to following the
competitive bidding requirements of the Louisiana Public Bid Law). If done so, determine if
the board formally adopted the use of the Louisiana Procurement Code (R.S. 39:1551-1755),
the set of laws that govern most state agencies' purchases of certain services, materials and
supplies, and major repairs.

This attribute was not applicable to the contract tested.

Determine if the procurement related to homeland security and was made from federal General Services Administration (GSA) supply schedules. If done so, determine if the entity (1) utilized a Louisiana licensed distributor; (2) used the competitive ordering procedures of the federal GSA; and (3) received prior approval from the director of the State Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness, or his designee.

This attribute was not applicable to the contract tested.

• Determine if the entity "piggybacked" onto another agency's contract. If done so, determine if there is documentation on file that clearly demonstrates the contract was a previously bid, viable contract and the price paid by the entity was the same as that contract's bid price.

This attribute was not applicable to the contract tested.

Determine if the contract was amended. If done so, determine whether the original contract
contemplated or provided for such an amendment. Furthermore, determine if the amendment
is outside the scope of the original contract, and if so, whether it should have been separately
bid and contracted.

This attribute was not applicable to the contract tested.

• Determine if the invoices received and payments made during the period complied with the terms and conditions of the contract.

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

• Determine if there is written evidence that the entity's legal advisor reviewed the contract and advised entering into the contract.

There was no documentation available to determine if the City's legal advisor reviewed the contract and advised prior to entering into the contract.

Determine if there is documentation of board approval, if required.

#### V. Payroll and Personnel

1. Obtain and review the entity's written policies and procedures for payroll and personnel and determine if they address the processing of payroll, including reviewing and approving of time and attendance records, including leave and overtime worked.

The City does have written personnel policies and procedures but they do not specifically cover the details of processing payroll.

Obtain a listing of employment contracts/agreements in force during the period under examination.
 Select the largest (dollar amount) employment contract and determine if all payments issued during the period under examination were done in strict accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract.

There was only one employment contract in place. The City of Leesville is under an intergovernmental agreement with the City of DeRidder, Louisiana for the use of one of their Police Lieutenants as a special officer in the Leesville Police Department. All payments issued to the City of DeRidder for the Lieutenant were done in strict accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract.

- 3. Select the attendance and leave records for one pay period and:
  - Determine if all employees are documenting their daily attendance and leave (e.g., vacation, sick, etc.). (Note: Generally, an elected official is not eligible to earn leave and does not document his/her attendance and leave. However, if the elected official is earning leave according to policy and/or contract, the official should document his/her daily attendance and leave.)

Of the 115 employees tested, four employee timesheets were not located by the City employees.

• Determine if supervisors are approving, in writing, the attendance and leave of all employees.

As a result of procedures performed, it was discovered that the time clocks in the Public Works department are not being utilized properly. Several employees are not utilizing the time clocks. Also, those employees utilizing the time clocks are not doing so consistently. This failure to consistently utilize the time clocks results in inaccurate and incomplete time records. The time cards are also not approved by anyone at the end of the pay period. The Public Works Secretary prepares a spreadsheet tracking employee attendance on a daily basis. At the end of the pay period a summary of this spreadsheet is approved by the Public Works Director.

 Determine if the entity is maintaining accurate written leave records (e.g., hours earned, hours used, and balance available) on all eligible employees.

4. Select the five highest paid employees and determine if changes made to their hourly pay rates/salaries during the period under examination were approved in writing and in accordance with policy.

Of the five highest paid employees tested, there was no documentation of pay rates used for the 2010-2011 fiscal year for one of the employees tested. The last payroll change notice was in 2007.

5. Select the five largest termination payments (e.g., vacation, sick, compensatory time, etc.) made during the period under examination. Determine if the payments were supported by documentation, made in strict accordance with policy and/or contract, and properly approved.

Of the five largest termination payments tested, one employee was paid sick leave even although he was not eligible according to the City's policy. The policy states that only upon retirement may an employee be paid for accumulated sick leave. There was no evidence of approval of this exception to the policy contained in the employee's personnel file. Based upon discussion with the City Administrator, he does not recall authorizing the payment.

6. Determine if any employees were also being paid as contract labor during the period of the examination.

There were no exceptions noted as a result of procedures performed.

We were not engaged to perform, and did not perform, an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on management's assertions. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the use of the management of the City of Leesville, Louisiana and the Legislative Auditor, State of Louisiana, and should not be used by those who have not agreed to the procedures and taken responsibility for the sufficiency of the procedures for their purposes. Under Louisiana Revised Statute 24:513, this report is distributed by the Legislative Auditor as a public document.

Kolder, Champagne, Slaven & Company, LLC Certified Public Accountants

Lafayette, Louisiana December 16, 2011

### City of Leesville

## Management's Corrective Action Plan June 30, 2011

## I. Financial Management

Finding – Question 3(b): The accounts payable policies and procedures do not cover how vendors are added to the vendor list and there are no checks and balances to ensure compliance with the public bid law.

Recommendation: We recommend that someone separate from the accounts payable clerk be authorized to add or delete vendors. The accounts payable clerk should have not have access to change the vendor list. Someone independent of the purchasing function should have the responsibility to oversee the purchasing function to make sure that the City is complying with the City's purchasing requirements and/or public bid law requirements.

Corrective Action Plan: We will get with our computer consultants to see if we have the general controls in our software to limit access to changing vendors. If not, we will assign someone independent of the purchasing function to authorize all changes to the vendor list and to monitor such on an ongoing basis. In addition we will assign someone independent of the purchasing function to monitor compliance with the public bid law requirements.

Finding – Question 3(d): The City has no written policies and procedures for receipts, including receiving, recording, and preparing deposits.

Recommendation: We recommend that the City adopt policies and procedures for receipts, including receiving, recording, and preparing deposits. Segregation of duties needs to be considered, while drafting these policies and procedures. Someone independent of the depositing and recording of receipts should stamp all checks for deposit only and list all receipts received in the mail. Subsequently the list should be compared to the actual deposits.

Corrective Action Plan: We will implement the auditor's recommendations.

#### II. Credit Cards

Finding – Question 2: The accounts payable policies and procedures briefly mention processing credit cards receipts for payment.

Recommendation: We recommend that either the accounts payable policies and procedures be expanded or a separate credit cards policy be adopted. The following items should be addressed: how cards are to be controlled, allowable business uses, documentation requirements, required approvers, and monitoring card usage.

Corrective Action Plan: The City will adopt and implement written policies and procedures covering the use of credit cards and fuel cards. The credit and fuel card usage policy will address how credit and fuel cards are to be controlled, define allowable business use and charges, define a method for monitoring usage and required approvals and proper documentation.

## City of Leesville

## Management's Corrective Action Plan June 30, 2011

Finding – Question 3(A): Five of the 120 credit card transactions reviewed were not supported by the original receipt and/or supporting documentation of the business/public purpose. The City does not require departments to turn in receipts for fuel purchases with using the fuel track cards.

Recommendation: We recommend that the City enforce its policy that credit card expenditures do not be accepted and paid for unless all the required documentation is submitted. If the employee cannot provide adequate documentation such amounts charged on the credit card should be reimbursed by the employee. Consider having the employees who use credit cards sign an authorization form authorizing the City to withhold unallowable credit cards charges from payroll as a deduction if the policy is not adhered to.

Corrective Action Plan: We will implement the auditor's recommendations.

Finding - Question 3(C): Five of the 120 credit card transactions were not supported by written approval from a department head or the City Administrator.

Recommendation: All credit card transactions should be approved by a department head and/or the City Administrator.

Corrective Action Plan: All credit card transactions will be closely reviewed to make sure that such transactions have the proper documentation of approval by a department head and/or by the City administrator.

### III. Travel and Expense Reimbursement

Finding – Question 2(A): Five of the eleven travel expense reimbursements did not have the appropriate and necessary business purpose of the travel and four were not approved by the City Administrator. All of the expenditures appear to be related to City business even though the business purpose was not documented on the receipts.

Recommendation: We recommend that business/public purpose be documented for all travel reimbursements and for meal charges, there should be documentation of the individuals participating.

Corrective Action Plan: Travel expenses not properly documented and approved will not be reimbursed to the employee similar to credit card expenditures not properly documented.

#### IV. Contracts

Finding – Questions 1 and 2: The City does not have written policy and procedures for contracts/contracting, including leasing. The City does not have centralized control and oversight of contracts.

## City of Leesville

## Management's Corrective Action Plan June 30, 2011

Recommendation: The City needs to have written policies and procedures detailing what types of services requires written contracts, standard terms and conditions, whether legal review is required or not, and approval and monitoring process. Someone should maintain a list of contractual obligations summarizing the contractor, contact information, contract period/renewal period, responsible party, terms and conditions, etc.

Corrective Action Plan: The City will adopt and implement policies and procedures whereas someone is specifically identified with oversight responsibility of all contracts and that a list of all contracts is maintained summarizing significant provisions of such contracts.

## V. Payroll and Personnel

Finding – Question 1: The City does have written personnel policies and procedures but they do not specifically cover the details of processing payroll.

Recommendation: We recommend that the personnel policies and procedures be expanded to include the steps of processing and approving payroll.

Corrective Action Plan: The personnel policies and procedures will be expanded to include the steps of processing and approving payroll.

Finding – Question 3: Of the 115 employees tested, four employee timesheets could not be located and it was discovered that public works employees are not utilizing the time clocks consistently.

Recommendation: We recommend that timesheets be submitted and maintained for all employees who are required to prepare one. Administration should meet with the Public Works Department Supervisor and determine an appropriate and accommodating employee time recordkeeping system and incorporate such in the City's policies and procedures.

Corrective Action Plan: The City will implement the auditor's recommendation.

Finding – Question 4: Of the five highest paid employees tested, there was no documentation to support the pay rates used for the 2010-2011 fiscal year compensation in the personnel folder for one employee.

Recommendation: - All personnel files should have the supporting documentation authorizing the employee's compensation.

Corrective Action Plan: All personnel files will be reviewed to make sure the supporting documentation supporting the employee's compensation is in the file. The personnel files will be kept updated.

# KOLDER, CHAMPAGNE, SLAVEN & COMPANY, LLC

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

C. Burton Kolder, CPA\* Russell F. Champagne, CPA\* Victor R. Slaven, CPA\* P. Troy Courville, CPA\* Gerald A. Thibodeaux, Jr., CPA\* Robert S. Carlor, CPA\* Arthur R. Mixon, CPA\*

Tynes E. Mixon, Jr., CPA
Allen J. LaBry, CPA
Allen J. LaBry, CPA
Albert R. Leger, CPA, PFS, CSA\*
Ponny Angolle Scruggins, CPA
Christine L. Cousin, CPA
Mary T. Thibodeaux, CPA
Marshall W. Guidry, CPA
Alan M. Taylor, CPA
Jamos R. Roy, CPA
Robert J. Metz, CPA
Robert J. Metz, CPA
Kelly M. Doucet, CPA
Choryl L. Barlley, CPA
Mandy B. Self, CPA
Paul L. Delcambre, Jr. CPA
Wende F. Arcemont, CPA, CVA
Kristin B. Dauzat, CPA
Richard R. Anderson Sr., CPA
Carolyn C. Anderson, CPA
Matthew E. Margaglio, CPA
Jamo R. Hebert, CPA

Retired: Conrad O. Chapman, CPA\* 2006 Harry J. Clostio, CPA 2007

\* A Professional Accounting Corporation

OFFICES

183 South Beadle Rd, Lafayette, LA 70508 Phone (337) 232-4141 Fax (337) 232-8660 450 East Main Street New Iberia, LA 70560 Phone (337) 367-9204 Fax (337) 387-9208

113 East Bridge St. Breaux Bridge, LA 70517 Phone (337) 332-4020 Fax (337) 332-2867 200 South Main Street Abbeville, LA 70510 Phone (337) 893-7944 Fax (337) 893-7946

1234 Devid Dr. Sie 203 Morgan City, LA 70380 Phone (985) 384-2020 Fax (985) 384-3020 1013 Main Street Franklin, LA 70538 Phone (337) 828-0272 Fax (337) 828-0290

408 West Colton Street Ville Platte, LA 70686 Phone (337) 363-2792 Fax (337) 363-3049 133 East Waddii St. Marksville LA 71351 Phone (318) 253-9252 Fax (318) 253-8681

332 West Sixth Avenue Oberlin, LA 70655 Phone (337) 639-4737 Fax (337) 639-4568 621 Main Street Pineville, LA 71360 Phone (318) 442-4421 Fax (318) 442-9833

WEB SITE WWW.KCSRCPAS.COM

The Mayor and the City Council
City of Leesville
Leesville, Louisiana

During our audit of the basic financial statements of the City of Leesville, Louisiana (City) for the year ended June 30, 2011, we noted certain areas in which improvements in the accounting system and financial practices of the City should be considered.

MANAGEMENT LETTER

- The City did not comply with personnel policies and procedures governing vacation and sick leave. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011, one employee was paid accumulated sick leave. This employee was not eligible for such a payment under the City's policy, and there was no written approval from the City Administrator maintained within the personnel files.
- 2011-12 Policies and procedures should be implemented to ensure that adequate documentation of Louisiana Employee Withholding Exemption Certificate, Form L-4, and employee authorized deductions, if any, and that authorized pay rates are placed in personnel files.
- 2011-13 For the year ended June 30, 2010, the City's utility system collected sales taxes on sewer sales. Sewer sales are exempt from Louisiana sales tax. Although this practice has been discontinued, the City should make arrangements to recover sales tax monies remitted to the state since July 1, 2009. The City should also credit customers' accounts for sales taxes incorrectly charged.
- The City's system of tracking the compensated absences is not centralized. It was also noted that not all leave has to be approved before being taken. The City should develop and implement procedures to ensure that all employee leave is properly authorized and accounted for.
- 2011-15 For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2006, the City had questioned costs relating to overtime and equipment costs for the Police Department associated with hurricanes Katrina and Rita. There was an overstatement of costs associated with Hurricane Katrina of \$51,763 which was requested and received. Therefore, the City owed the federal government \$51,763 for overstated costs. For the year ended June 30, 2007, the City recorded a liability for the \$51,763 but did not properly remit the funds. As of June 30, 2011, these funds remain unpaid.

Member of: AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS Member of: SOCIETY OF LOUISIANA CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

- 2011-16 Management should implement policies and procedures to ensure that proper documentation is maintained for all travel expenses. This documentation should include the public purpose of the travel and proper written approval.
- 2011-17 The City does not have formal written policies and procedures in place covering the processing of payroll transactions. The City should prepare and adopt policies and procedures detailing the processing of payroll transactions. This policy should address the approval process for timesheets and vacation and sick time used. This policy should also address the proper use of time clocks by hourly employees.
- The City's accounts payable/purchasing procedures do not discuss how vendors are added to the vendor list and there are no checks and balances to ensure compliance with the public bid law. In addition, the City does not have written policies and procedures for handling receipts. We recommend that someone separate from the purchasing function have authorization to add and/or delete vendors. In addition procedures need to be implemented to monitor compliance with the public bid law requirements. Policies and procedures for receiving, recording, and preparing deposits need to be adopted.
- 2011-19 Payroll taxes and/or employee withholdings were not being submitted timely. We recommend that the City Administrator and Finance Director make certain there are procedures in place to make certain that payroll taxes continue to be deposited timely without exception.

We would like to express our appreciation to you and your staff, particularly your office staff, for the courtesies and assistance rendered to us in the performance of our audit. Should you have any questions or need assistance, please feel free to contact us.

Kolder, Champagne, Slaven & Company, LLC Certified Public Accountants

Lafayette, Louisiana December 16, 2011